




THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Book is DUE on the last
amped b'lo

OF CALIFORNIA

WHEELER
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A HISTORY OF EDUCATION

A HISTORY OF EDUCATION

BY

THOMAS DAVIDSON

AUTHOR OF "ARISTOTLE AND THE ANCIENT EDUCATIONAL IDEALS,"
ROUSSEAU AND EDUCATION ACCORDING TO NATURE," ETC.

9247

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1215 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1901

Dec. 20. 1901

COPYRIGHT, 1900, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

TROW DIRECTORY
PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING COMPANY
NEW YORK

PREFACE

To be strictly accurate, the title of this book should have been "A Brief History of Education, as Conscious Evolution." To record, even summarily, the facts and events in the long history of education, within the narrow limits of a text-book, would have been both impossible and undesirable. My endeavor has been to present education as the last and highest form of evolution—that great process which includes both Nature and Culture. I have tried to show what it is that evolves, why it evolves, and why evolution, finally attaining to consciousness, becomes education. Seeing that the immanent purpose of evolution is the realization of free individuals, that is, moral personalities, I have endeavored to mark the steps by which this has been gradually attained, and to indicate those that have yet to be taken.

By placing education in relation to the whole process of evolution, as its highest form, I have hoped to impart to it a dignity which it could hardly otherwise receive or claim. From many points of view, the educator's profession seems mean and profitless enough, compared with those that make more noise in the world; but when it is recognized to be the highest phase of the world-process, and the teacher to be the chief agent in that process, both it and he assume a very different aspect. Then

teaching is seen to be the noblest of professions, and that which ought to call for the highest devotion and enthusiasm.

In the present work I have given special attention to those portions of educational history that are usually ignored or neglected, at the expense of those that are more generally known. This accounts for the chapter on Muslim Education and several others. And I have laid somewhat less stress on those portions of the history treated in the "Great Educators," issued by the same publishers.

Reference to the Bibliography will show that I have made very little use of previous histories of education. The reason of this is, not that I failed to appreciate them, but that my aim was different from theirs.

Some of my generalizations are, I know, open to question. In defence, I have only to say that in all cases I have given what seemed to me best calculated to impart a comprehensive view of the entire subject.

The quotations at the head of most of the chapters are intended as texts for lectures or discussions.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

NEW YORK, April 20, 1900.

STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, LOS ANGELES, CAL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BOOK I

SAVAGE, BARBARIAN, AND CIVIC EDUCATION

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY	1
II. THE RISE OF INTELLIGENCE	13
III. SAVAGE EDUCATION	18
IV. BARBARIAN EDUCATION	24
(A) <i>Ancient Turanian Education</i>	30
(1) Sumir and Akkad (Chaldæa)	32
(2) Egypt	37
(3) China	41
(B) <i>Ancient Semitic Education</i>	45
Babylonia and Assyria	47
(C) <i>Ancient Âryan Education</i>	55
(1) India	58
(2) Iran (Medo-Persia)	66
V. CIVIC EDUCATION	75
(1) Judæa	77
(2) Greece	86
(3) Rome	105

BOOK II

HUMAN EDUCATION

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY	115
<i>DIVISION I.—SUPERNATURAL BEGINNINGS OF HUMANISM</i>	
CHAPTER	
I. HELLENISTIC EDUCATION	117
II. THE CHRISTIAN "CATECHETICAL SCHOOL" OF ALEX- ANDRIA	121
III. PATRISTIC EDUCATION	127
IV. MUSLIM EDUCATION	133
(I.) <i>Propædæutic and Logic</i>	139
(II.) <i>The Natural Sciences</i>	141
(III.) <i>The Rational World-Soul</i>	145
<i>DIVISION II.—MEDIÆVAL EDUCATION</i>	
I. PERIOD OF CHARLES THE GREAT	151
II. SCHOLASTICISM AND MYSTICISM	159
III. THE MEDIEVAL UNIVERSITIES	166
IV. RENAISSANCE, REFORMATION, AND COUNTER-REFORMA- TION	175
<i>DIVISION III.—MODERN EDUCATION</i>	
I. THE FIFTEENTH, SIXTEENTH, AND SEVENTEENTH CENT- URIES	190
II. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	209
III. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	220
IV. THE OUTLOOK	254
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	277
<i>INDEX</i>	283

BOOK I.

SAVAGE, BARBARIAN, AND
CIVIC EDUCATION

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY

Desire then in the beginning arose, the first germ of mind. The bond betwixt Non-Being and Being, as knowledge, wise men find hid in their hearts.—VEDA.

Feeling is a primitive datum. The question, therefore, is not how feeling arises, but how it is modified and how it gives birth to sensation.—ROSMINI, *New Essay*, § 717.

The *Ego* which reflects upon itself, finds that, at bottom, it is a feeling that constitutes the sentient and intelligent subject.—*Ibid.*, § 719.

The sentient subject . . . is not deduced from a long train of reasoning, but from a simple analysis of the idea of *existing sensation*. . . . To conceive an existing sensation is to conceive a substance.—*Ibid.*, § 643.

While philosophers are wrangling over the government of the world, Hunger and Love are doing their work.—SCHILLER.

It is not in knowledge, as such, but in feeling and action that reality is given.—A. SETH, *Man's Place in the Cosmos*, p. 122.

Intellectus rerum veraciter ipsæ res sunt.—SCOTUS ERIUGENA.

HISTORY, as at present understood, is a record of evolution, which, according to Mr. Spencer, is a "change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, through continuous differentiations and integrations." EDUCATION is conscious or voluntary evolution. Hence, HISTORY OF EDUCATION is a record of such evolution, and begins at the point

where man takes himself into his own hand, so to speak, and seeks to guide his life toward an ever more definite, coherent heterogeneity, which is what we mean by his ideal end.

Of the beginning of evolution we have no experiential knowledge, and, indeed, cannot even imagine it as beginning. A popular evolutionist tells us: "The earliest condition in which Science allows us to picture this globe is that of a fiery mass of nebulous matter. At the second stage it consists of countless myriads of similar atoms, roughly outlined into a ragged cloud-ball, glowing with heat, and rotating in space with inconceivable velocity. By what means can this mass be broken up, or broken down, and made into a solid world? By two things—mutual attraction and chemical affinity. The moment when within the cloud-ball the conditions of cooling temperature are such that two atoms could combine together, the cause of the evolution of the earth was won. . . . With every additional atom added, the power, as well as the complexity of the combination increases. As the process goes on, after endless vicissitudes, repulsions, and readjustments, the changes become fewer and fewer, the conflict between mass and mass dies down; the elements, passing through various stages of liquidity, finally combine in the order of their affinities, arrange themselves in the order of their densities, and the solid earth is formed.

"Now, recall the names of the leading actors in this stupendous reformation. They are two in number, mutual attraction and chemical affinity. Notice these words, attraction and affinity. Notice that the great formative forces of physical evolution have psychical

names. It is idle to discuss whether there is, or can be, any identity between the thing represented in the one case and in the other. Obviously there cannot be. Yet this does not exhaust the interest of the analogy. In reality, neither here nor anywhere, have we any knowledge whatever of what is actually meant by attraction; nor in the one sphere or the other have we even the means of approximating to such knowledge. . . . Here, as in every deep recess of physical Nature, we are in the presence of that which is metaphysical, that which bars the way imperiously at every turn to a materialistic interpretation of the world. Yet . . . what likeness, even the most remote, could we have expected to trace between the gradual aggregation of units of matter in the condensation of a weltering star and the slow segregation of man in the organization of societies and nations? However different the agents, is there no suggestion that they are different stages of a uniform process, different epochs of one great historic enterprise, different results of a single evolutionary law? ” *

To the last question we may unhesitatingly answer, Yes. We may even go further, and assert that, unless we are to be condemned to the author's hopeless agnosticism, and the evolution of the world is forever to remain a mystery to us, it must be interpreted in terms of experience, that is, at bottom, of feeling, including desire. Nor ought this to surprise us; for, since the world of experience—and we can talk intelligently of no other—consists of nothing but feelings grouped and classi-

* Henry Drummond, *The Ascent of Man*, p. 337 sqq. Cf. Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, cxviii. and Epilogue, near end; also Vedic Hymn, in Max Müller's *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 564.

fied, there is every reason for interpreting it in terms of feeling. Such interpretation is mere analysis, as it ought to be, involving the assumption of nothing outside of experience. If we assume feeling, including desire, as the stuff of the world, we have no difficulty in explaining evolution upon known principles. There can, in the last analysis, be no intelligible active principle but desire; and, since all desire is a tendency to greater depth or variety of feeling, it is, of necessity, an evolutionary energy. Further, all desire implies the existence of something desired, but not possessed, or of environment, and so we are forced to conceive of feeling as atomic, or individual, in its nature. The world is made up of a multitude of what we may call "substantial feelings," each having all the rest for its environment,* and each, through desire, modifying, and being modified by, all the rest. The sum of the modifications of each substantial feeling by all the rest is its world, and the sum of the modifications of all feelings is *the* world.

How one substantial feeling can become aware of the existence of another is a question requiring more detailed treatment than can be given it here; but that each such feeling is completely impervious to all others is a fact of hourly experience. By no possibility can I feel your toothache, however clearly I may realize it in my own imagination. You must always be to me an *hypothesis* (or *ὑπόστασις*). This is the price we pay for our eternal individuality. Nor does it involve ag-

* We must take care not to imagine that behind the "fundamental feelings" (Rosmini's phrase) there is a substance, unpenetrated by feeling. Such a thing-in-itself, being beyond experience, would open the door for a boundless agnosticism.

nosticism, but merely the consequence that omniscience is a social product, shared in by all beings.

If we adopt this view of the constitution of the world, a view accordant with all experience, we see at once that all evolution is, in a sense, education. It is the gradual internal differentiation of substantial feelings, their transformation or articulation, through mutual desire and interaction, into worlds. Education, in the widest sense, may be defined as the upbuilding of a world in feeling or in consciousness. With our present habit of confining feeling to the animal world, and making it include a certain amount of memory or consciousness, we find it hard to regard the inanimate mineral world, and even the animate vegetable world, as due to the interaction of feelings. Yet all that they are to us is so much feeling—so many clusters of sensation—and, unless we are to attribute the introduction of life to a miracle, and acknowledge the bankruptcy of science, we must regard the very lowest forms of matter as, to a certain extent, alive and sentient. One thing is obvious: except in so far as they are feelings, we can never know anything about them. And what could they be in or for themselves, that is, apart from our knowledge of them, if they were not feelings?

If this reasoning is correct, then the entire evolution of the world, from lowest to highest, is simply the external aspect of the education of substantial feelings, or, to use a familiar term, of spirits. It is true, indeed, that actual experience has not enabled us to supply all the links in the long chain. Especially desiderated are the links between the inanimate and the animate, and between instinctive and ethical life. Yet we need not

despair of one day discovering these. Of the former, Huxley, a sober witness, says: "With organic chemistry, molecular physics, and physiology yet in their infancy, and every day making prodigious strides, I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call 'vital' may not, some day, be artificially brought together. . . . If it were given me to look beyond the abyss of geologically recorded time to the still more remote period when the earth was passing through physical and chemical changes, which it can no more see again than a man can recall his infancy, I should expect to be a witness of the evolution of living protoplasm from not living matter." * Of the second missing link I shall speak further on.

One more quotation from Huxley! "If there is one thing clear about the progress of modern science, it is the tendency to reduce all scientific problems, except those which are purely mathematical, to questions of molecular physics—that is to say, to the attractions, repulsions, motions, and co-ordination of the ultimate particles of matter. Social phenomena are the result of interaction of the components of society, or men, with one another and the surrounding universe." † Huxley had to remain an agnostic (to use a word of his own invention) to the end of his days. The reason why he did so is plain from the above quotation. He maintained that all scientific problems, not strictly mathe-

* *Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews*, p. 366. How something living can evolve from something not-living is utterly inconceivable, implying creation. Huxley (*ibid.*, p. 146) tells us that "matter may be regarded as a form of thought," which is hardly correct.

† *Ibid.*, p. 166.

mathematical, must be solved in terms of the relations of the ultimate elements of matter, and then most gratuitously assumed that these elements were "particles." But such particles do not come within the reach of experience, and, if they did, they could only be groups of feelings. Hence, the ultimate elements of matter are feelings. Let us, then, substitute "feelings" for "particles" in the quotation, and we at once do away with the possibility of agnosticism, and obtain a formula which accounts for evolution, from first to last—even for the mathematical aspect of it. We may now write: All scientific problems may be reduced to the attractions, repulsions, motions, and co-ordination of the ultimate substantial feelings. Even social phenomena are the result of the interaction of the components of society, of men (who are merely substantial feelings highly differentiated through long and extensive interaction), with one another and with the remaining universe of substantial feelings of all grades. In other words, all the world that we know, or can know, consists of primitive substantial feelings, differentiating themselves, through interaction, into worlds. The voluntary or reflective part of this differentiation we call education.

It is fortunate that there exist now, in the world, beings at all stages of evolution, from matter up to man, and that the latter is the sum and epitome of the entire process thus far. In spite of this, we find it very difficult to realize the exceedingly simple psychical life of the primal elements of inorganic matter, and even of organic bodies of low type—plants, microbes, snails, etc. The attractions and repulsions, resulting in the motions and co-ordinations of material molecules, we

can conceive only as due to the desires of spirits, and yet we cannot throw ourselves back into their inner states. The case is not very different with plant life. Who can realize the feelings and desires of those primal elements which build up an oak or a vine? Yet we can hardly doubt that a feeling of thirst is what makes a plant send out its root-mouths in the direction of water, and a feeling of weakness what induces it to encircle a support with its tendril-arms. So, in general, perhaps, we may interpret the actions of plants in terms of our own feelings. And this we can do more securely in the case of animals. No one can well doubt that a monkey, a dog, a rabbit, a tadpole, or an amœba eats, drinks, and moves in consequence of feelings similar to ours when we do the same. Thus we are able, in ways more or less vague, to realize to ourselves those sentient desires which are the agents in all evolution, and so, to that extent, to understand the world. It may be that, in the future, through hypnotism or some such agency, we shall be able to recall into consciousness the entire course of past evolution.

Evolution, then, is the material of science, including history, and of philosophy. In the future, philosophy will not, as in the past, imitate theology in trying to dictate to science from without, but will be simply the complete record of which the particular sciences are the co-ordinated parts.* Even now philosophy is able to tell us that all evolution is a matter of association for the satisfaction of desire,† that the universe is essentially

* Philosophy is completely unified knowledge. Spencer, *First Principles*, Pt. II., cap. 1, § 37.

† See Aristotle, *Politics*, I., 1; 1252a seq.; *Ethics*, I., 1; 1094a seq.; and cf. Dante, *Purg.*, X., XI.

social; that the evolution of sentient individuals into an ever richer world depends upon ever widening and deepening relations to other sentient individuals; that socialism and individualism are absolutely co-extensive all the world over. What is true of human society is true of all nature; and the principles which we find governing the former we may confidently look for in the latter. The true meaning of the lowest phases of evolution can be found only in the highest, just as the meaning of the acorn can be found only in the full-grown oak.* The first step will not be fully understood until the last is taken, which will never be!

Taking human society, then, as the highest type of all association, we can readily see that it has three possible forms, and no more †—(1) co-ordination or democracy, (2) individual superordination, or monarchy, and (3) a combination of the two, oligarchy. The bodies in the mineral world seem to be democracies, no atom or individual being lord over another; and the same is true, to a certain extent, of the plant world. Many of the lower forms of animal life—worms, protozoa, coelenterates, etc., are oligarchies; ‡ but the higher we go in the scale the more nearly do the forms approach the condition of monarchy. In man, the sentient elements composing the body are in almost entire subjection to the central sentience which he calls himself. § Where there is no rebellion, we have a man of integrity, an integer; otherwise, a dissolute or fractional man. But

* In Aristotelian language, the oak is the "what-it-was-ness" (τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι) of the acorn. See *Metaph.*, Z., 4; 1030a, 17, with Bonitz's note.

† See Aristotle, *Politics*, III., 7; 1279a, 22 seq.

‡ Rosmini, *Psychology*, § 462 seq. Geddes and Thomson, *Evolution of Sex*, Chapp. VII., XIV.

§ Shakespeare, Sonnet CXLVI.

even in a completely integral body, monarchical as a bee-hive, there are arrangements for swarming, or colonizing. Certain subordinate combinations, which we call reproductive cells, sunder themselves naturally from the whole, and, carrying with them its potentialities, set up a new monarchy, a new human body, for themselves. In the case of these, the process of evolution, which originally took millions upon millions of years, is completed in a few prenatal months. Thus, through beneficent association, every animal organism is able to raise subordinate organisms, of almost the lowest form, to its own level in a short time, and thus spare them uncounted ages of evolutionary struggle. It is no secret at the present day that the human embryo, before birth, goes through the whole process of evolution, assuming, in an ascending series, all the lower forms of animal life, just as, after birth, it passes through all the phases of ethical life. It is all one continuous process, producing ever more complete and independent individuals, through ever deepening and widening social relations. Here come in the great questions of heredity and habituation.

If, now, we ask how, out of primitive desiderant feelings, the various types of animal life—microbes, mollusks, whales, men—have arisen, we readily find an intelligible answer, supported by obvious facts, and at the same time full of meaning for the educator. As we have already seen, the primitive desiderant feelings, whose interaction evolves the world and explains it, have two aspects—a passive (feeling) and an active (desire). In the lowest phases of existence these are completely balanced, a fact which we express by saying that,

in physics, action and reaction are always equal. But, just in proportion as we rise in the scale of being, and reaction becomes less and less immediate, this balance disappears. Indeed, we may perhaps say that the position of beings in that scale is determined by their power to inhibit direct reaction and to treasure up their passive impressions for future use, such treasuring-up being the origin of consciousness. Consciousness is, from one point of view, inhibited reaction. So long as impressions are treasured up, solely with a view to purposive future reactions, the balance between action and reaction may still be kept even, and this is the only healthy condition of things; but it may also become uneven, either because impressions are treasured up for the mere pleasure they give, or because the reactions are excessive or purposeless. In the former case, we have a stagnant, dalliant sensuality; in the latter, a fatuous, spasmodic activity. Both these are equally unfavorable to evolution, the one producing beings of the Caliban, the other, beings of the Ariel, type.* Just as the perfect balance between passive feeling and active desire keeps open the path of evolution, so the loss of this balance blocks it, and gives rise to all the sub-human, unprogressive forms of life, and to all those types of humanity—savages, barbarians, heathens†—that have fallen, or are falling, behind in the race of life. If a house divided against itself cannot stand, so a living being whose nature is out of balance cannot progress—a fact of no small con-

* See *The Tempest*. It is quite evident that Caliban and Ariel are meant, respectively, as types of sensuality and caprice. Ferdinand and Miranda are balanced progressive types.

† Ἔθνη, peoples who, though civilized, have not risen above national or race interests. The future belongs to peoples who have risen to human interests.

sequence to educators. Many living types have died out from mere inner disharmony or one-sided evolution.* Man has risen above the brute condition simply because he has been able to hold the balance between feeling and action comparatively even, and his further advance will depend upon how far he is able to do this in the future. Though, from one point of view, he stands over against, or above, nature,† in another, he is merely its highest product. In order to explain him, its entire process is required, and this can be learnt only through scientific investigation. "To ingenious attempts at explaining by the light of reason things which want the light of history to show their meaning, much of the learned nonsense of the world has indeed been due." ‡

* Tennyson, *In Memor.*, LV., LVI., CXVIII.

† By "nature," I, of course, mean, not a power standing outside and above the individuals whose interactions produce the world, but merely the sum and system of those interactions themselves. It is unfortunate that, in our time, Nature (with a capital) is often spoken of as if it were God, *minus* consciousness.

‡ Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I., pp. 19 seq.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISE OF INTELLIGENCE

Under what circumstances, and how long ago, man first rose above the brute, we cannot at present say. That the event may have been sudden, like an avalanche, or the turning of a balance, is quite possible; that it took place many millions of years ago seems certain. In the course of that long period, certain portions of the race—those which have kept open the path of evolution—have passed through the stages of (1) Savagery, (2) Barbarism, (3) Civicism or Civilization, and are now advancing to (4) Humanism—while the rest have remained behind, some at each of the lower stages. Now, since each of these stages has its corresponding education, the History of Education naturally falls into four divisions: (1) savage, (2) barbarian, (3) civic, (4) human. We shall treat them in this order; but before doing so, we must outline the leading features of each of the divisions, and, first of all, state the principles according to which they are distinguished.

Though the grades of humanization pass, for the most part, insensibly into each other, yet, regarded from a sufficient distance, they are readily distinguishable. The scale upon which all evolution is measured is simply that of being. That which is more is higher than that

which is less. Now, since, as we have seen, being is feeling, or desiderant feeling, it follows that that which has (or, rather, is) more, and more highly differentiated, feeling and desire, is higher than that which has less. And we may perhaps set it down that the body of every living being fairly represents the amount and articulation of its desiderant feeling; for, as Spenser says, "The soul is form, and doth the body make."

Here is offered a favorable opportunity for withdrawing the clumsy expression, "desiderant feeling," and substituting for it the ordinary term, "soul," which, when carefully examined, proves to have just that meaning. Soul is the fundamental, substantial feeling and desire, of which all other feelings and desires, and, ultimately, the known world itself, are determinations or articulations. My world is nothing but my self or soul—the feeling which I am—modified and articulated. We shall see later what is implied in such articulation. One group of such articulations is the body, a system of subordinate feelings, by which the soul carries out further articulations and produces its world. If the view here taken of the soul be correct, then the much vexed question of the immortality of the soul becomes almost ridiculous. Can that of which all things in time and space, and these themselves, are but modifications, vanish in time? So long as feeling and desire continue merely such, so long the soul which they constitute remains in a brute condition, without any world of things.* It is only when, under the pressure of complicated and unmanageable experience, they give birth to intelligence and will, themselves remaining in the

* See Aristotle, *Metaphys.*, I., 1; 980b, 25 seq.

form of love,* that the soul emerges from this condition, and begins to have a world of things, with language to designate them by. It is then that it begins to be human. Intelligence is simply the grouping of feelings and the referring of them, as so grouped, to origins, or subjects, or things. Thinking is, in the strictest sense, thing-ing.† Until there are things, there are no thoughts, and *vice versa*. As soon as things are thought‡ and symbolized, then desire, taking the form of will, relates itself to them as means, or instruments, of satisfaction—the only possible end. Since subjects, or things, can never be matters of experience, but are, so to speak, hypotheses,§ to group experience for use as means, they can be realized only through symbols or conventions,|| and of such language consists. All words originally designated things, that is, hypothetical agents, uniting and causing certain groups of experiences. What corresponds internally to the uttered or uttered word is the concept, or grasping-together of experiences (*Begriff*), a combining act of the soul, capable of indefinite repetition.

In emerging from the brute state, then, man found

* We thus see why love is never quite rational, though it constantly tends to become so.

“To be wise and love

Exceeds man's might; that dwells with gods above.”

Troilus and Cressida, III., 2.

† Cf. Ger. *denken*, *Ding*; Latin *reor*, *res*; Greek *χράω* (declare), *χρῆμα*. In Hebrew, *dābhār* means both thought and thing. Cf. Arabic *shay'* (thing), from *shā'a* (desire).

‡ In the second Prologue to *Faust*, the Lord says to the archangels: “The Becoming (i.e., genesis, evolution), which ever works and lives, embrace you with love's gracious bounds; and what hovers in unsteady seeming, do ye make steady with enduring thoughts.” Nothing could be finer!

§ “Hypothesis” (*ὑπόθεσις*) means exactly the same as “subject” (*sub-jectum*).

|| Σύμβολον, convention, watch-word, creed.

himself a thinking, loving, willing being, in a world of concrete things or beings, grasped by means of symbols and available as instruments of satisfaction. In other words, he found himself a symbol-making, aim-setting, tool-using animal. The symbol-making power which gave him his present, real world enabled him to project into the future a more satisfactory, ideal world; his aim-setting faculty, love, turned this into an object of aspiration; and his tool-using gift made him employ the present world as a means for realizing it.* Such has been, and is, the life of man. In the first stages of his career, his world, his aims, and his tools were meagre; but as he advanced they became richer. This increasing richness coincides with the progress of civilization.

In distinguishing the grades of civilization, then, and the corresponding forms of education, we must consider, at different stages, (1) man's actual world, (2) his ideal world, (3) the manner and degree in which he uses the former for the realization of the latter. The first will give us his science; the second, his art; the third, his ethics, corresponding, respectively, to the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. The True is what man holds to be; the Beautiful (or desirable), what he holds ought to be;† the Good, the choice and use of the proper means for passing from the True to the Beautiful. The Beautiful, when realized, becomes the True, which again makes way for a higher Beautiful. It is plain from this that education, at each stage, falls into three branches: (1) Education in the formation of an actual world, (2)

* He holds even the sun and moon to be made for his use. See Gen. I., 14, and cf. the opening chapter of the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard, in which the present world is treated as means.

† "Beauty is its own excuse for being."—EMERSON.

Education in the conception of an ideal world, (3) Education in the method of using the former for the realization of the latter.

If man's faculties always developed evenly and harmoniously, the history of civilization and education would be easy to write; but since, as we have seen, this is not the case; since there is much one-sided development, and consequent retardation or retrogression, much variety and difficulty are introduced into the task. As affording practical lessons, the history of retarded or frustrated developments is as valuable as that of healthy or normal ones. The lower grades of civilization are very similar all the world over;* but as we advance the number of aberrations increases. Hence, while we can treat savage education in a single chapter, each of the higher grades will require several.

* "One set of savages is like another," said Dr. Johnson, and this is largely confirmed by modern research. See Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I., pp. 6 seq.

CHAPTER III.

SAVAGE EDUCATION

In the instinctive act all is hereditary ; in the reflective act there is nothing hereditary ; everything is derived through imitation, or taught by experience.—PANIZZI, *Le Tre Leggi*, p. 57.

It is certain that man attains his position of pre-eminence above all other animals . . . essentially through the fact that he is able to *produce*, that is, by his labor to transform that which in nature is useless into things useful and fit for consumption.—*Ibid.*, p. 74.

Sacramental words, according to Catholic doctrine, are words of power.—SYDNEY F. SMITH, S.J., in *Contemporary Review*, January, 1897, p. 35.

In all stages of civilization the human being “comes into the world,” not as a naked soul, or sensibility, but with an organized body, and with its feeling and desire correspondingly organized in the form of senses and spontaneities. It is the function of education to train these, so that he may attain the greatest possible satisfaction or harmony. This harmony, the essential condition of evolution, is twofold, harmony among his faculties and harmony with his environments,* sub-human and human. The chief influence in the training of the human faculties is Imitation,† or, viewed from the other side, Example, which, as culture advances,

* On these harmonies see Plato, *Republic*.

† See Baldwin, *Mental Development*, Chapp. IX.-XII.

gives way to Precept or Instruction. / At the savage stage, education is mainly imitation, becoming, with time, more and more conscious, but never requiring any special institution or school for its impartment. |

Man, as we have seen, in building up a world through, and for, intelligence and will, does so by grouping his feelings or experiences into things, or objects, through concepts, or ideas,* which he fixes and holds by means of symbols. These symbols play so important a part in the growth of intelligence that they deserve careful consideration. They are, namely, of two kinds, (1) audible, (2) visible. The former go to constitute language; the latter, religion. Thus language and religion have a common root, and are as old as the dawning of intelligence. We may, indeed, say that all primitive thought is religious or superstitious.

It is difficult for us, moderns, to realize how concept and sensible symbol were related to each other in the mind of the savage. We may perhaps say that, for him, the symbol, instead of representing the object, contained its essence or concept. Hence the extreme importance attached by him to the audible word and the visible fetich.† In uttering the name of a thing, he was breathing forth its essence, for good or for evil; in adoring or anointing a fetich, he was controlling its essence.‡

* These ideas are simply distinctions in feeling.

† Such fetich might be natural or artificial. Art owes its origin to the endeavor to make natural fetiches conform to the concepts contained in them. It is interesting to note that the word *shēm*, in the language of the Hebrews, who have carried the religious stage of thought to its highest perfection, means (1) essence, (2) name, (3) monument or fetich. See the Third Commandment, and cf. Dent. XII. 5; 1 Kings VIII. 16, 19; Is. LV. 13 etc.; also Westcott, *Epist. of St. John*, pp. 243-45; Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions*, Vol. I., p. 4, note * (Eng. Trans.).

‡ Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I., pp. 115 seq., and last quotation at the head of this chapter.

Herein we have the original form of worship, namely, magic, made up of incantation and ritual. The distinction of essence, concept, and symbol has been one of the hardest tasks of intelligence.

Though savage education, as not being conscious evolution, might properly be excluded from treatment in this book, it may, nevertheless, be briefly considered, on the ground that it shows, in their primitive form, the two departments of all education—education with reference to the seen and education with reference to the unseen, or, roughly speaking, practical education and theoretical education. The savage divides his activities between work and worship. Through both he seeks the satisfaction of his desires, which at first are but two—hunger and love. Under the former we include all those physical desires that have reference only to the individual himself—thirst, desire for clothing, shelter, rest, etc.; under the latter, those that have reference to other individuals—desires for self-reproduction, the pleasures of family life, etc. The former is the source of all the egoistic or selfish feelings; the latter, of all the altruistic or neighborly feelings. By work, the primitive man seeks to satisfy the hunger (defined as above) of himself and family; by worship, to guard them against danger from those powers which he imagines as lying behind the phenomena, but against which his own strength is unavailing. The rule of work forms the basis of ethics, which culminate in politics and cosmopolitics; the presuppositions of worship form the basis of religion, and, later on, of art, science, and philosophy. In work, man uses things; in worship, the essences or “names” of things. The former are always

individual; the latter, always universal. The visible stone, or tree, is confined within its own limits; the essence, or name, within the stone or tree has far-reaching influence. When this distinction is clearly drawn, the essence is supposed to be able to pass from thing to thing, *e.g.*, from a human body into a stone; and, later on, to be capable of subsisting by itself, and moving from place to place. Thus arises the notion of disembodied essences or ghosts. One can even make an essence pass into a thing by pronouncing its "name" over it; hence the practice of consecration. When essences are conceived as connected with large portions of nature—sky, sea, earth, sun, moon—they become gods.

Savage education, then, consists in learning how to obtain the necessities of life for self and family, and how to propitiate the unseen powers supposed to be active in nature. In his efforts after the former the savage learns the use of tools and means, and is thus clearly distinguished from the lower animals. He also learns to manufacture tools and means from wood, stone, clay, bone, wool, fibre, and hides. Of the use of the metals and of fire he knows nothing. His affections are confined to the members of his family or tribe, and to those things upon which he depends for his well-being—cattle, dogs, etc.—and the spirits of his ancestors. All these, indeed, are considered members of the tribe, bound together by blood-ties,* the only ties he knows. To him,

* To strengthen these ties, some member of the tribe—a man or an animal—is killed from time to time, and his, or its, flesh and blood partaken of by all the other members, the ancestral ghosts receiving their portion in the form of blood poured upon the stone or other object into which their essence is supposed to have passed. This is the origin of sacrifice, which originally has nothing to do with propitiation. See Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 236 seq.

kin and friend, non-kin and enemy, are synonymous terms.* His will is trained to run in definite conventional ruts, and is hardly ever exercised in original ways. Indeed, the savage, despite his apparent liberty, is, in almost every sense, a slave—a slave to his own needs and to dread of unseen powers. Even in the use of material things he has no freedom; for he is continually afraid of offending the essences contained in them. Hence he wastes his time in the performance of all sorts of propitiatory rites, and, after all, does not get rid of fear.†

Though there are many grades of savagery,‡ and the line between it and barbarism is not clearly defined, yet its chief characteristics may be enumerated. Savages learn to use things, but rarely forces; hence their chief implements and vessels are of wood, stone, or clay, which can be shaped without fire. They devour their food without cooking, and, being nomads, live either in natural caves or in temporary huts. Their arts are confined to the manufacture of hunting and fishing implements, earthen vessels, and clothing. In the ornamentation of these they sometimes show rudiments of an artistic sense. They acknowledge no social tie but the blood tie; hence, their highest form of organization is the “sib,” family, or clan. They are governed by use

* In Scotland, even to-day “freen” quite often means kin.

† For many ages this fear prevented savages from applying fire to human uses. It was held to be divine and inviolable, and the story of Prometheus’ theft of it from heaven, and of the vengeance which pursued him, is merely an echo of the feelings which followed this application. In the religion of Zoroaster, the same fear of polluting fire exists even at the present day. See Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, *passim*.

‡ These depend largely upon climate. In warm regions, where hunger can be satisfied without labor or implements, and clothing and shelter are hardly needed, men rise but little above the higher brutes. It is in ruder climates, where “necessity is the mother of invention,” that they rise higher. Grade of invention marks grade of culture.

and wont, not having reached that degree of abstraction and generalization which would enable them to formulate laws. It follows that free individualism has no place among them. Their religion, which is also their science, is animism, or a belief in essences of a ghostly sort, pervading all nature; consequently, their worship consists of magical ceremonies, intended to propitiate these. In such circumstances it is easy to see that their whole education is obtained through imitation, or use and wont—*συνήθεια*, as the Greeks said. The further progress of culture consists in the gradual evolution of the individual, that is, his emancipation from use and wont.

CHAPTER IV.

BARBARIAN EDUCATION

Listen to the woes of mortals, and how I raised them from their former infantile condition to reason and intelligence. . . . At first, seeing, they saw in vain, and, hearing, they heard not; but like to the forms of dreams, they thoughtlessly, for long ages, confused everything, knowing nothing of brick-built houses exposed to the sun, or of working in wood, but dwelling underground, like puny ants, in the sunless depths of caves. They had no token of winter, of flowery spring, or of fruitful summer, but acted altogether without reflection, until I at last showed them the risings of the stars, and their settings, hard to discern. Moreover, I discovered for them number, the highest of artifices, and the combinations of letters, the muse-mothered instrument for the recording of all things. And I first bound great beasts to yokes, making them submit to collars and to carrying (human) bodies, so that they might be bearers of men's greatest burdens. And I brought horses under the chariot-rein—a monument to superfluous luxury. And none other than I invented the sea-wandering, canvas-winged vehicles of sailors. . . . Greatest (discovery) of all, if anyone fell sick, there was no remedy in the form of either food or ointment or drink; but they pined away for lack of medicines, until I showed them mixtures of soothing remedies, whereby they ward off all diseases. Many forms of divination too I arranged, and I was the first to distinguish among dreams those destined to become a waking vision, and expounded to them mysterious sounds. Omens on journeys, and the flight of crooked-taloned birds I clearly defined, showing which are lucky in their nature, and which unlucky, what are the habits of each, and what their mutual hates, loves, and conclaves; moreover the smoothness of entrails and the color they must have to be pleasing to the gods, and the manifold lucky forms of the gall-bladder. And having roasted limbs wrapt in fat and the

long chine, I guided men to a mysterious art. And I gave sight to the flame-symbols that formerly were blind. So much for things above ground. And as to the human aids hidden underground—brass, iron, silver, gold—who would claim to have discovered them before me? No one, I am sure, who did not wish to babble in vain. In one brief saw, learn the whole at once: All human arts are from Prometheus.—ÆSCHYLUS, *Prometheus Bound*, ll. 450 seq.

The principal criteria of classification (of grades of culture) are the absence or presence, high or low development, of the industrial arts, especially metal-working, manufacture of implements and vessels, agriculture, architecture, etc., the extent of scientific knowledge, the definiteness of moral principles, the condition of religious belief and ceremony, the degree of social and political organization, and so forth.—TYLOR, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I., pp. 27 seq.

Human culture advances in proportion as men husband their powers by the use of implements, and by union for mutual help. Such husbandry demands ever higher and higher education.

The barbarian, as distinguished from the savage, stage of culture, begins at the point where men learn to control natural forces—fire, water, wind—and to apply them directly to the satisfaction of their own desires. So long, of course, as these forces were regarded as governed by essences susceptible of influence through magical rites, so long they eluded man; and it required a certain impiety, that is, an advance from the religious to the scientific attitude, to enable him to apply them fearlessly to his own uses. How such advance was at first regarded we learn from such stories as those of Cain and Abel,* Prometheus,† etc.

* See Lenormant, *The Beginnings of History*, Chap. IV. ("The Fratricide and the Foundation of the First City").

† On the origin and meaning of this world-myth see Kuhn, *Die Herabkunft des Feuers*. Prometheus does not come from Pramantha, as he supposes.

The great event which carried men over from savagery to barbarism was what we may call the desecration of fire—the stealing of it from heaven, as the Greeks said. Through this men were enabled to do three things: (1) to cook their food, (2) to smelt metals and shape tools of them, (3) with these tools to engage in many arts previously impossible—to quarry and dress stone, and with it to build houses and towns;* to turn up the soil and engage in agriculture; to improve their weapons of offence and defence; or, in one word, they were enabled to pass from nomadic to settled life. The new arts called for a division of labor unknown before, and for a new education. Thus men came to be divided into trades or guilds, each of which gave special instruction in its own art. The earliest form of conscious instruction was guild-instruction, of which apprenticeship is a modern survival.

If in savagery human desire was articulated into but few needs, and these capable of direct satisfaction, in barbarism this articulation was enormously increased, and life became greatly complicated. There now supervenes division of labor, which weakens the blood-tie by bringing into close relations persons having a common occupation, and by establishing a professional tie, to which is soon added a local one. Miners, smiths, carpenters, etc., form associations and dwell in the same localities. In agricultural districts the very soil forms a social bond. Among the earliest social distinctions is that between those that occupy themselves with the

* Town (A-S. *tūn*, Ger. *Zaun*) means, properly, enclosure. Towns were originally mere places of refuge, or castles. It was only when increase of culture brought increase of danger that they became towns, in our sense.

seen and those that occupy themselves with the unseen—between laity and priests, as we should say. Then comes, in the laity, the distinction between those who, by their labor, supply the necessities of life, and those who devote themselves to defence, or between the industrial and military classes. Thus there arise the three social castes—priests, soldiers, producers. In each of these again there are subdivisions. The priests divide into propitiators or sacrificers* and soothsayers or prophets;† the soldiers into privates and officers, the chief of whom is king; the producers into as many professions as there are useful arts. No sooner are these three classes fairly distinguished than there springs up between them a rivalry for power. In the ensuing conflict the third class generally succumbs, sinking into a position of inferiority, and even of servility, while the conflict goes on between the other two. Three results are possible. The victory may rest either (1) with the priests, who will rule by superstitious fear, as in India,‡ or (2) with the soldiers, who will rule by force, as in Assyria,§ or (3) with the two combined, as in Egypt.|| Each class now receives a distinct education, suited to its functions, and always through gilds. As yet there is no education for manhood or citizenship. Man, being still a means, a mere limb of the social body,

* Sacrifice, from being a tribal meal, intended to strengthen the blood-tie, gradually becomes a means of satisfying or propitiating the invisible members of the tribe, and, later on, of other demons and gods. See p. 21, note, and cf. Robertson Smith, *Relig. of the Semites*, pp. 196 seq.; Davidson, *Education of the Greek People*, p. 33.

† See Wellhausen, *Reste arab. Heidenthums*, pp. 128 seq.

‡ See Frazer, *Lit. Hist. of India*, pp. 148–69.

§ See Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. I., pp. 241 seq.

|| See Sayce, *Egypt of the Hebrews*, pp. 53 seq.

is educated for subordination and function, not for freedom.

Perhaps the most important result of the division of society into professional castes is the rise of a leisured class—the priests, who, as mediators of the unseen, are the founders of all the “liberal” arts and sciences. As their power is due mainly to their success in convincing the other classes of the influence of the unseen upon human affairs, they are compelled, with a view to forecasting the future, to observe the course of these and to keep a record of their past experiences. Thus they come to study astronomy and meteorology, and to invent writing. Having discovered the influence of the sun, moon, and stars upon the seasons, they often extend this influence to other things, and so give rise to the pseudo-science of astrology. Nevertheless, with recorded observation the basis of science is laid.

Next to the discovery of fire, the invention of writing was the most important event in barbarian culture. The one made the arts, the other the sciences, possible. At first, all writing was pictorial, representing, not sounds, but things. It was by a very slow process, lasting for thousands of years, that it became phonetic. Picture-writing, being necessarily cumbersome and, at best, requiring an interpreter, called into existence guilds of professional scribes—*Schriftgelehrte*, as the Germans say—who not only wrote, but likewise kept alive the meaning of old writings. These guilds, which were closely connected with the priesthood, kept records, on stone or burnt clay,* not only of astronomical and

* On stone (later on papyrus) in Egypt, on clay in the nations of the Euphrates Valley. On the earliest writing see Fr. Delitzsch, *Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems*.

meteorological, but also of historical, occurrences, and, after a time, began to write down incantations, prayers, laws, and poems. All such records were carefully preserved in libraries connected with the temples, and were read by the scribes on solemn occasions.* Reading was by no means yet a popular accomplishment. Thus it came to pass that the priests were the depositaries of all learning, and the temples the schools.† It naturally followed that all education was theological, concerning itself with the essences or spirits underlying phenomena. This involved a serious drawback, the cause of much superstition. The barbarian mind was not content with defining the essences by their known acts, but endowed them with all sorts of human attributes, passions, capricious will, etc., whereby they were turned into arbitrary beings, requiring to be flattered and propitiated.‡ This may be said to be the distinguishing mark of barbarian culture, which, however, it long survived.

Several ancient nations may be taken as representing barbarian culture. We shall confine ourselves to six: (1) Sumir and Akkad, (2) Egypt, (3) China, (4) Babylonia and Assyria, (5) India, (6) Media and Persia. Modern ethnologists and philologists divide the peoples that have risen above savagery into three families: (1) the Turanian, (2) the Semitic, (3) the Âryan, which appeared upon the stage of history successively in this order.§ Adopting this division, we may say that Sumir,

* See 2 Kings XXII., XXIII. ; Nehemiah VIII.

† In Muslim lands, even at the present day, schools and universities are nearly always in mosques. Cf. Matth. XXVI. 55; Acts V. 25, etc.

‡ See the prayer of Chryses, Homer, *Iliad.*, I., 37-42, and mark its mercenary implications.

§ See Max Müller, *Lect. on the Science of Language*, First Ser.

Akkad, Egypt,* and China are Turanian; Babylonia and Assyria, Semitic; and India, Media, and Persia, Âryan. These three families on the whole represent three different stages of culture within barbarism itself. So far as we know, the Turanians were the founders of barbarian culture, the first astronomers, the inventors of writing.

(A) ANCIENT TURANIAN EDUCATION

While there is a very striking similarity between all tribes and races at the savage stage of culture, there is a growing differentiation as we progress in the barbarian stage. Nevertheless, in all the forms of Turanian culture there are many notable resemblances. Most remarkable is the fact that it seems to be already old, before we know anything about it. Alike in Akkad, Egypt, and Etruria, men seem to be earnest, gloomy, reflective, weary of this life, and strongly inclined to brood on another—a sure sign of decadence. Their abodes, or rather their places of refuge, remind us of caves, being towers built of masses of brick or huge blocks of undressed stone. They worship in caves mostly; their temples are tombs, and their tombs temples. Their religion is marked by mystery and gloom; their worship by bloody rites, magic, and incantation. Their gods are deities of the dark, rather than of the light, inspiring fear, rather than joy. They honor

* The ethnology of the Egyptians is ill-understood, but at present they may conveniently be classed as Turanians. It is probable that Hittite and Etruscan (Tyrrhenian, Pelasgian) culture was Turanian, but the subject is obscure. I am aware that this view of the three races meets opposition in many respectable quarters; but I state what seems to me the truth.

women, lay great stress on the family bond, and believe in its continuance after death. Hence they build sumptuous and permanent abodes for the departed, and hold frequent and familiar converse with them. They have a firm belief in immortal ghosts, and are strongly inclined to ancestor-worship. They practise agriculture, dig canals, and pursue several of the useful arts. They use fire, and smelt and shape several of the metals, chiefly copper, gold, and silver. They discover bronze, and make such extensive use of it that the barbarian age has sometimes been called the bronze age. They study astronomy and learn to determine roughly the length of the year. They use magical rites and incantations to drive away disease, which they suppose to be due to evil spirits. Even when they use medicine, it is on account of its supposed magical virtues. Their form of government is theocratic, exercised through priests and kings, the latter often claiming divine descent. Education for all professions is imparted through guilds, and there is none other—no education for freedom or manhood.

To the Turanians are due the first organization of a priestly, scholarly class, holding itself aloof from all other classes, and also the compilation of a religious literature, with myths—creation, fall (?), flood, etc.—laws, and liturgy. The distinctions, cleric and lay, natural and supernatural, clean and unclean, sacred and profane, are due to them. All organized religious systems can, I believe, be traced back to them.* To them

* Even Abraham is said to have come from "Ur of the Chaldees," and I think there can be little doubt that the Hebrew Yahweh was originally a Turanian deity, perhaps *Ed*. See Margoliouth, in the *Contemporary Review*, Oct., 1878 (*The Earliest Relig. of the Anc. Hebrews*).

also must be attributed the first clear assertion of the immortality of the soul and the earliest sense of sin. The latter has its origin in a dread of avenging spirits and in a tendency to brooding self-criticism, a characteristic of the race. Finally to the Turanians we owe the week and the Sabbath.

(1) *Sumir and Akkad (Chaldæa)*

The four great hieroglyphic systems—Egyptian, Cuneiform, Hittite, and Chinese—sprang undoubtedly from rude picture-writings, probably first known in Asia, and which may have been the one common original of them all.—CONDER, *The Hittites and their Language*, p. 136.

Egypt and Babylon [Sumir and Akkad] led the way and acted as the pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, textile industry seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries.—RAWLINSON, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. I., p. 60.

The oldest barbarian culture seems to have arisen among certain Turanian or Mongol tribes in the valley of the Euphrates. Whence these came we know not—probably from the northeast; but at least ten thousand years ago they had founded two kingdoms—Sumir to the south, Akkad to the north—and worked out a culture far in advance of savagery. They built castles, followed agriculture and the useful arts, studied astronomy, and invented writing. I cannot better give a notion of their culture than by translating a passage from Professor Delitzsch's work, already referred to:*

* *Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems*, pp. 214 seq.

“The Sumirian written characters,” he says, “afford us a glimpse into the state of culture prevailing among the people at the time when writing was invented. The following attempt to outline the culture of that primeval period is based exclusively upon those characters which must be assigned to the primitive stratum of the Sumirian system of writing. Signs, regarding which there is any possibility of suspicion that they may be of comparatively recent origin—such, *e.g.*, as the ideograms for cedar and wine—and, of course, all groups of signs, with a very few well-weighed exceptions, have been excluded on principle.

“The region occupied by the people who invented writing was beyond measure fruitful. The vegetation of the soil, which was highly blessed with water and sunshine, and, in addition, artificially irrigated by a close net of canals and rivulets, as well as by other means, was the most luxuriant conceivable. The date-palms were overladen with fruit, and forests of gigantic reeds covered the broad marshes on the seashore.

“Agriculture and cattle-raising were the occupations of the inhabitants in time of peace. With the help of the plough(?) they loosened the soil for the reception of the seed, and rich crops sprang from the bosom of the earth. They planted garden-beds and gardens, while on the meadows grazed herds of cattle, sheep, and goats, tended by herdsmen, crook in hand, and at night shut up within hurdles in the open field. In the Sumirian family the females were subordinate to the males. The wife was regarded mainly as the bearer of children, and the offspring was uncommonly numerous. The father was the guardian of the house, and was

supported by his sons, who contributed to the protection of the family, especially of the younger members and, above all, of their sisters. The father-in-law seems to have enjoyed special distinction. Bread and fruit, milk and butter, water and intoxicating date-wine furnished food and drink. Besides oxen, sheep, and goats, they had, as domestic animals, dogs and asses. They hunted for birds and fish with nets, and took particular delight in keeping the former in cages. Of wild animals they knew the buffalo. There were snakes, too; but the great drawback to the life of these primitive settlers was the immense number of vermin. For clothing they used chiefly the skins of animals, making use of the precious stones, found in their own country and the neighboring districts, for all sorts of adornment.

“They dwelt originally in huts made of reeds, but at a very early date they built themselves houses of bricks, for which the alluvial soil of Babylonia offered an inexhaustible source of material, combining these into a firm structure by means of asphalt, which is also found in large quantities on the spot. Their dwellings, which were meant chiefly as a protection against the sun’s rays, were roofed with boards and surrounded by spacious, enclosed courts. The entrance could be closed with folding-doors which might be bolted and barred with wooden pegs. A clump of houses, that is, a larger settlement, possessing, of course, a cistern, was surrounded with a wall, intended for protection against hostile intrusion. For the use of carts and wagons, which were drawn by beasts of burden, there were special paths or roads. The dead were buried. The burial-place, which was the entrance to the ‘land

whence no traveller returns,' was looked upon as the 'dark abode,' or the 'great city,' of which all men are destined one day to be inhabitants.

"At the head of one or more settlements stood a 'great man' (*lu-gal*), or king, who, as became his dignity, resided in a 'great house' (*ê-gal*), or palace. The inhabitants of the settlement were his instruments or subjects, and their union formed the people. The king acted as judge, and in war as general. Armed with bows and arrows, daggers and swords, the people went out to war against their enemies, and made slaves of their captives, both male and female.

"The appearance of the new moon was the chief measure of time. The new moon marked the beginning, the full moon the middle, of the month, which was reckoned at thirty days, while the waning moon, like the setting sun, was regarded as the symbol of weakening, vanishing, returning.

"Black was to them the color of the night; white, that of the breaking dawn. Yellow and green seemed to them garish, whereas everything dark, for example the gray of the clouds, seemed full, saturated color.

"The starry heaven was to them the home of the gods, at whose head were the gods of heaven, sun, and moon, and in relation to whom man was nothing more than a slave, or even a dog, whose duty it was to worship, in the deepest reverence, with his face in the dust. A special house, built with special care and splendor, in a chamber of which, protected on all sides from profane gaze, lay the statue of the divinity, was set apart as the place of worship. Prayer and sacrifice were regarded as peculiarly pleasing to the gods. Such a

temple had its foundation exactly facing the four cardinal points of the compass—North (the ‘straight’ direction), East, South, and West, and surrounded by a wall with the same orientation. This custom had its origin in the notion that the earth, which formed the foundation of the celestial palace, had sides facing the four cardinal points. Besides the celestial gods, those primitive settlers on the Persian Gulf worshipped sea and water gods, chief among whom was the goddess Gur. Craven superstition also was in full blast; on the steppe all sorts of storm-demons pursued their uncanny practices, and even the manes of the departed could, as ghosts, bring destruction. Fire, which was produced by the revolution of one piece of wood in another, was worshipped as the special helper against all dark hobgoblins, and the fire-god was looked upon as the subduer of all spells. Even the priests, besides performing the service of the temple, gave attention to exorcism, or the overcoming of hostile demonic powers, above all of diseases, in the name of the gods, and were highly respected as magicians. They were at the same time the bearers of the higher spiritual culture. Even the discovery of writing, as the very sign for man shows, was the work of the priests.”

Here we have an excellent picture of barbarian culture, with its improvements and its limitations. It does not, indeed, show us how education was imparted; but it does show us the results of education. The writer, further, maintains that the Sumiro-Akkadians had a special gift for abstraction and combination, for numerical and spatial relations, and for everything mathematical, and also that, when inventing writing, they

tried rather to find symbols for dust, wind, and abstract ideas than to make pictures of fish and corn-ears. This would tend to show that their effort was to express essences, rather than things, as, indeed, we might have supposed. Things need no symbols; indeed, we may say they are symbols.

It is highly probable that the earliest schools in the world were in Sumir and Akkad. With the invention of writing they became a necessity. They were conducted by the priests and attended mainly, if not wholly, by members of the priestly class, the only one laying any claim to learning.* Under barbarian culture, priest and scholar are synonymous terms. When schools were once established, no doubt other things besides writing soon came to be taught in them; but all such teaching, whether of history, chronology, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, or divination, was confined to the priestly order. Thus it came to pass that in the old Turanian States of Mesopotamia the distinction between cleric and layman was first clearly drawn.

(2) *Egypt*

When the early inhabitants of Chaldæa are pronounced to have belonged to the same race with the dwellers on the Upper Nile, the question naturally arises, which were the primitive people and which the colonists?—RAWLINSON, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. I., p. 54.

The new facts that have been disinterred from the grave of the past furnish a striking confirmation of Professor Hommel's theory, which connects the culture of primitive Egypt with that of primitive Chaldæa, and derives the language of the Egyptians, at all events

* The same was true during the Middle Age, which, in many respects, reverted to barbarism. Clerk—cleric.

in part, from a mixed Babylonian in which Semitic and Sumirian elements alike claimed a share.—SAYCE, *Contemporary Rev.*, Jan., 1897, p. 22.

The recorded history of ancient Egypt goes back six or seven thousand years, and implies a much longer unrecorded history.* When the people first appears, it has already passed through the village-community and town stages of culture, and has assumed the form of a monarchy, or, rather, of two monarchies—Upper and Lower Egypt. This fact seems largely due to the necessity for regulating the Nile throughout its whole known course, in order to make life in the country at all possible. Without some sort of association among the numerous “nomes,” such regulation would have been altogether impossible. But though Egypt had advanced thus far, she had dropped no element from her past, and this is perhaps the strangest and most instructive thing about her. Everywhere we find the crudest and most primitive conceptions, customs, and institutions co-existing with the most advanced. She worships stocks and stones, cats and oxen, alongside high conceptions of divinity.

From the earliest known times the Egyptian monarchy has the three social classes—priests, soldiers, producers—well defined. The government is in the hands of the first two, who usually play into each other’s hands. The king is the embodiment and representative of the supreme god, and rules by divine right. The useful arts are well advanced, and so are the fine arts—

* In some respects it is almost altogether a history of decay. The oldest art of Egypt is the best, and some of it is very good. It steadily declines till the country falls into the hands of Alexander and the Greeks.

architecture, sculpture, painting, literature, and music, not to speak of working in the precious metals. The mechanical power displayed in the architecture of the early pyramids and temples is truly astonishing, especially when we remember that the huge blocks of which they are constructed were often transported hundreds of miles by water. Nor is the technical skill displayed in much of the early jewelry less remarkable. Astronomy was carefully studied, but had not the religious significance attached to it in the Euphrates Valley. Writing goes back to the earliest times, and its development can be traced all the way from a pictorial to an almost phonetic condition. Inscriptions on temples and tombs were numerous, and books were written on many subjects—astronomy, agriculture, statesmanship, ethics, medicine, etc.; while literature, in the narrower sense, was represented by numerous poems and stories. The “Book of the Dead,” which may be called the Bible of the Egyptians, being a complete guide to the lower world, existed in numerous copies, and was frequently buried with the dead. Papyrus was used as writing material, and libraries of papyrus-rolls were collected, especially in the temples. There also were the principal schools for scribes, musicians, architects, mathematicians, and astronomers. Though education was thus mainly in the hands of the priests, yet at some periods the art of writing was common among the laity.

The oldest book in the world is said to be the Moral Aphorisms of Ptah-hotep, which exerted a wide and lasting influence. Its morality is altogether of the practical or prudential sort, like that of the Chinese. Indeed, Egyptian education, as a whole, was practical and

professional, making no effort to develop free men, and knowing nothing of science for science' sake, or virtue for virtue's sake. Its aim was to enable each citizen, by labor and by a harmless life, to obtain as much satisfaction as possible in this world, and, by rites and ceremonies, to insure the favor of the gods, and, hence, an easy existence in the next world, conceived after the fashion of this. It is but fair to say, however, that righteousness weighed as much as sacrifice with the gods. Believing in a ghostly immortality and an ultimate resurrection, the Egyptians fixed their thoughts largely on the life to come, and were more concerned to provide for it than for the present one. Hence, though not without joy and even mirth, their life was earnest and prosaically practical. They never ascended to any lofty ideals or philosophical conceptions, for which reason their art, even at its best, never attained to beauty, but remained on the level of symbolism. It everywhere expresses servitude, and not freedom. It overpowers by its mass, does not attract by its graciousness. It is not "its own excuse for being."

It is worthy of note that in Egypt, as in Turanian countries generally, women were permitted to enjoy the benefits of education, and to occupy a free and honorable position in society and state. They looked forward to immortality, and their graves were often adorned with great sumptuousness. To this fact and to the long isolation of Egypt were largely due the slow progress and long endurance of her institutions. Women and isolation make nations conservative. This isolation itself was largely owing to the fact that the Egyptians never developed the science of navigation beyond what

was necessary for sailing small boats on the Nile. To their superstitious minds the sea had weird terrors which they had not the courage to brave. Indeed, the science of navigation hardly enters into barbarian culture.

(3) *China*

What heaven has conferred is called the nature; an accordance with this nature is called the path of duty; the regulation of this path is called instruction.—CONFUCIUS, *Doctrine of the Mean*.

Man's commencement in life is such that his nature is radically good.

But as to nature, men are mutually near each other, whilst in practice they are mutually far apart.—Chinese Primer, first sentences.

In China, Turanian culture has continued to exist down to the present day; and it is perhaps there that we can best see its nature and limitations. Whether or not this culture is connected with that of the Sumiro-Akkadians, it has many of the same features as the latter, and, indeed, looks like a natural development of it, being visibly inferior to both Semitism and Âryanism. It is essentially of the family type, and, indeed, the family is its highest ideal and the object of its special reverence. Its religion is animistic, being a worship of ancestors and elemental powers, leading to a stagnant, prosaic, mechanical, prudential ethics. The language of the Chinese has remained at the isolating or juxtapositive stage, consisting of monosyllables, not outwardly connected; their writing has not risen above the pictorial or ideographic condition; their literature is dry, formal, uninspired, and almost childish. In a

word, we have in China a low type of culture developed to its highest possibilities, and seemingly incapable, from long lack of foreign contact, of changing into a higher. China is one great family, whose father is the emperor, exercising, in education and government, parental discipline.

As the fully-evolved form of a special type, the Chinese are naturally conservative in the highest degree. Their culture, which dates back no one knows how long—four thousand years at least—has changed but slowly in the course of the ages. Dynasty has followed dynasty; but the people remain the same, in beliefs and in ideals, praying daily, not “Thy kingdom come,” but “Thy kingdom abide.” Their highest ambition being to remain what they are, their attention is naturally directed to the past, and to the means of preserving it. Their education, therefore, is confined to the study of their ancient books, and the imparting of the reverential type of manners which these inculcate. Every attempt at originality of thought, or freedom of action, is strictly prohibited, as impious and un-Chinese, and every effort made to model the future on the past. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find that their education consists in thoughtlessly committing to memory ancient texts and writing essays and poems on them, in accordance with prescribed models. Those scholars who succeed best in this receive the highest rewards—state offices and patents of nobility. Indeed, education is the path to all public preferment in China.

In spite of this, the Chinese cannot be said to have any course of public education. They obtain their results by a system of government examinations more

elaborate than any that exists elsewhere. This system, which dates from very ancient times, assumed its present form about twelve hundred years ago, and is correlated with the civil divisions of the country. At the head of it is the Han-lin, or Academy of Peking. The lowest or preliminary examinations are held in the counties. Those who pass these are allowed to try a higher examination, held in the capital of the department. The successful candidates in this obtain a degree equivalent to our B.A., and take their first step in the ranks of the nobility. Later on, these bachelors undergo an examination, by commissioners from Peking, in the capital of the province, and, if they pass it, take a degree corresponding to our M.A., at the same time rising a step in the ranks of the nobility. They are also entitled to present themselves for the fourth, and last, examination, which is conducted by the Han-lin, at Peking, the capital of the empire, and lasts for thirteen days. Those who pass it take a doctor's degree, the candidates who head the list receiving special distinction from the emperor. The doctors have a right to public office at once, and, if they conduct themselves worthily therein, may rise to the highest dignities of the empire.*

Civil-service reformers who desire to see all public offices filled by competition will find their ideal realized in China. Should they proceed to estimate its value, however, by the present decrepit condition of the country, they would hardly arrive at fair conclusions, and that for several reasons: (1) The examinations are often unfairly conducted, and a good deal of bribery takes place. (2) No conclusion can be drawn from an edu-

* Laurie, *Hist. Survey of Pre-Christian Education*, pp. 135-41.

cation which, like the Chinese, stunts the intelligence and fossilizes the imagination, to any modern system which seeks to develop all the faculties. (3) No conclusion can be drawn from a people that refuses to progress to peoples whose chief aim is progress. (4) The present condition of China is due, not merely to her stagnant life, but also to recent contact with the outer world and the influx of foreign ideas, conditions for which she was altogether unprepared.*

The effect of China's attempt to arrest progress and make the present the slave of the past has been to weave a superficial order over a deep underlying chaos. China reminds one of Polonius, ready on all occasions to pour forth a flood of unexceptionable moral aphorisms, while remaining at bottom profoundly immoral and hypocritical, full of vanity, servility, and low cunning. She has never produced a philosophy, or even a consistent theology, but has remained on the level of prudential reflection. Her art never rises above grotesqueness, or, at best, sensuous prettiness. Much of the technique is exquisite, but it expresses nothing, and so remains mere virtuosity. Her religion is almost of the savage type, and even her ethics, upon which she specially prides herself, never rises above the level of prudence and propriety. This is true even of the ethics of Confucius (541-478 B.C.), who may be called the Chinese Messiah, and who is worshipped almost as a god. It is true that besides the national religion there are two others widely current in the country—(1) Tàoism, a kind of nature-mysticism, which readily degenerates into spiritism, magic, and shamanism; (2) Buddhism (imported about

* See Boulger, *History of China*, Vol. III.

A.D. 76), which has become a degraded idolatry, coupled with doctrines of metempsychosis and nirvana; but neither has sufficed to raise the Chinese above the Turanian level. It is characteristic enough that they have never risen to any clear notions of God, Freedom, or Immortality. They continually translate themselves back into nature, instead of translating nature forward into themselves, just as many of our modern evolutionists do.

(B) ANCIENT SEMITIC EDUCATION

The Semitic languages regard thinking as essentially as inner speaking or as a separating. . . . The characteristic fact remains that in thinking the Semite separates, the Indogerman [Âryan] combines.—GOSCHE, *Ghazzālī's Leben u. Werke*, pp. 309 seq.

In spite of all differences in language, character, manners, and mode of life among the various branches of the Semitic race, they all manifest a considerable family likeness, which shows itself in the uniformity and poverty of their languages, in the mere co-ordination and juxtaposition of their sentences; *i.e.*, in the inborn lack of philosophic thought, in their scanty capacity for truly æsthetic art-production, in their inability to develop a free political life. These peculiarities have their root in a strongly marked subjectivism, in the depths of a rich emotional nature, which forms the centre of Semitic spiritual life; in stern, restlessly active courage, in practical enterprise as well as in egoism, intolerance, and a claim to exclusive privilege, rising to fanaticism. In the Semitic spirit there appear two opposite elements, an irresistible tendency to self-assertion . . . and the most intense subjectivity, coupled with a wealth of dreamy emotionality, which often flames up into the loftiest enthusiasm, and is the cause which has enabled the Semitic race to produce the three religions of spiritual monotheism—the Hebrew, the Christian, and the Muslim.—SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Pædagogik*, I⁴, pp. 250 seq.

In remote ages the Semites were nomads, ranging probably in the Arabian desert, where many of them are still to be found. They were a rude, savage, active people, delighting in animal freedom and leading a robust, warlike life, fearing neither God nor man. Living in a region where nature and man are alike capricious, and never knowing when they might be in danger from either, they learned not to worry about the morrow, not to calculate the future, but to be on the alert against the possibilities of to-day. They were interested in the present, and cared little about past or future. They lived in tents, by means of their flocks and herds, and these were almost their sole possessions. Of agriculture, architecture, and the useful arts they knew almost nothing. Their religion was animism, much concerned with *ginn* and other weird beings whom they sought to propitiate.* Occupied fully with this life, they formed no conceptions or hopes with regard to another. They guided their nightly journeys by the stars, and sang short lyrics on love and heroic deeds. They regarded women as merely slaves, or instruments of passion. Their language and literature reveal their character. The Semite expresses himself in abrupt, disconnected sentences, each corresponding to a single intuition. His language contains nothing that implies a synthetic effort of intelligence. It has no compound words, few subordinating conjunctions, few relatives, and, strictly speaking, no tenses. It is the language of men living alert in the present.

From time to time, for thousands of years, the Semites

* See Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I., 417-Vol. II., p. 361, and Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 113 seq.

sent out swarms, which settled in lands already occupied by Turanian culture—Babylonia, Assyria,* Egypt,† Canaan, Greece, Italy. Adopting this somewhat decrepit and gloomy culture, they imparted new vigor to it, freed it from much of its gloom, and combined it with their own restless and warlike tendencies, thus developing into settled nations of great power, whose monuments in Babylonia, Assyria, and other lands still surprise us. Through a combination of Sumiro-Akkadian religious conceptions and practices, they became the religious people of the world *par excellence*, looking for all important truth to divine revelation, and not to scientific investigation or reflection. Their strongly theological tendency pushed them on to monotheism, and that in two forms. They either merged their various gods into one, thus arriving at a widely diffused being of many and various attributes, or else they elevated one god to supreme rank, and made all the others his sons or angels. In the one case they paved the way for pantheism and mysticism; in the other, for monotheism proper and a moral law. The Babylonians (like the Egyptians) took the former course, while the Assyrians with their Asur, and the Hebrews with their Yahweh, took the latter.‡

Babylonia and Assyria

Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top

* See Sayce, *Lect. on the Religion of Ancient Babylonia and Assyria*.

† There is no doubt that the Hyksos, who ruled Egypt from B.C. 2550 to 1597, were Semites. While in Egypt they adopted its civilization, excepting its religion.

‡ See Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*. It need not be added that pantheism is the source of the doctrine of divine immanence, monotheism of the doctrine of divine transcendence.

was among the thick clouds. . . . I made him fair by the multitude of his branches: so that all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him.—EZEK. XXXI. 3, 9.

The Chaldæans belong to the most ancient of the Babylonians, and, as a caste, hold the same position in the state as the priests do in Egypt. Being devoted to the worship of the gods, they philosophize during their whole lifetime, and have the highest reputation in astrology. They are also much given to divination, and prophesy the future, while, at the same time, they endeavor to ward off evil and bring about good by lustrations, sacrifices, or incantations. . . . The study of these things they do not pursue in the same manner as the Greeks do. Among the Chaldæans the philosophy of these things is a matter of family tradition. The son receives it from the father, and is exempt from all other public duty. Having their fathers as teachers, they have abundant opportunities to learn, and, at the same time, attend with greater confidence to what is taught them. Moreover, since they receive instruction from their very earliest years, they attain great proficiency, both because these years are the most impressionable, and because the time of study is thereby lengthened. Among the Greeks, on the contrary, most people take up the study of philosophy late and unprepared, pursue it awhile, and then give it up, being drawn away by material interests.—DIODORUS SICULUS, *Bibl. Hist.*, Bk. II., § 29.

Babylon was the source to which the entire stream of ancient civilization may be traced. It is scarcely too much to say that, but for Babylon, real civilization might not even yet have dawned upon the earth.—RAWLINSON, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. III., p. 76.

With much that was barbaric still attaching to them, with a rude and inartificial government, savage passions, a debasing religion, and a general tendency to materialism, they (the Assyrians) were, toward the close of their empire, in all the ordinary arts and appliances of life, very nearly on a par with ourselves; and thus their history furnishes a warning . . . that the greatest material prosperity may co-exist with the decline—and herald the downfall—of a kingdom.—RAWLINSON, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. II., p. 244.

Between the cuneiform script of Sargon and Naram Sin (B.C. 3800) and that of Nebuchadnezzar there is comparatively little

difference; between it and the script of the early texts . . . there lies the difference between the writing of a child and the writing of a grown-up man.—SAYCE, *Contemp. Rev.*, Jan., 1897, p. 85.

Name-giving was an important event in the child's life. Like other nations of antiquity, the Babylonians conformed the name with the person who bore it; it not only represented him, but in a sense was actually himself.—SAYCE, *Babylonians and Assyrians*, p. 44.

History and chronology, geography and law, private and public correspondence, despatches from generals and proclamations of the king, philology and mathematics, natural science in the shape of bears and birds, insects and stones, astronomy and astrology, theology and the pseudo-science of omens, all found a place on the shelves, as well as purely literary works. . . . In Babylonia every great city had its collection of books, and scribes were constantly employed in it, copying and reading the older literature, or providing new works for readers. . . . The library was usually within the walls of a temple, and sometimes it was part of the archives of the temple itself. . . . The school must have been attached to the library, and was probably an adjacent building. . . . The school in later times developed into a university. At Borsippa, the suburb of Babylon, where the library had been established in the temple of Nebo, we learn from Strabo that a university also existed which had attained great celebrity. . . . In Assyria education was mainly confined to the upper classes. The trading classes were perforce obliged to learn how to read and write; so also were the officials and all those who looked forward to a career in the diplomatic service. . . . In Babylonia it was otherwise. Here a knowledge of writing was far more widely spread, and one of the results was that varieties of handwriting became as numerous as they are in the modern world.—*Ibid.*, pp. 52-55.

Turanian culture had lasted for thousands of years and attained a considerable height in the regions of Sumir and Akkad, when it was rudely disturbed by the inroads of

semi-savage Semites from the Arabian desert, the "land of the bow." After much fighting, these at last made themselves masters of the whole of Mesopotamia. At first, six or seven thousand years ago, they settled in the southern portion, in Chaldæa, and built themselves towns in the midst of the Sumirians and Akkadians, gradually adopting their higher civilization and, with it, their system of writing, their religious literature, and their gods, and finally combining into a great Chaldæo-Semitic kingdom, with its centre at Babil (Babylon).^{*} Later on, they spread northward from Chaldæa, and founded the powerful empire of Assyria,[†] with its centre, first at Ashur, later at Nineveh. From about B.C. 2000 to 606, Assyria was the more powerful state, extending its sway over the whole of Western Asia, including Cyprus, and sometimes even Egypt; but, after the latter date, Babylonia once more rose to eminence, only to succumb, in less than a century, to the Persian Empire of Cyrus the Great (B.C. 538).

During the long rule of the Semites in Mesopotamia, their culture never belied its double origin, and never rose above barbarism to civic freedom. The moral person, if we may so speak, was still the nation, against which the individual had no rights. Even before the arrival of the Semites in Chaldæa, the distinction between priests and laymen had been clearly drawn. After that event, this distinction was further emphasized by the fact that, while the military class of the Chaldæans gradually yielded its

^{*} See Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vols. I. and II.; Sayce, *Lect. on the Relig. of Ancient Assyria and Babylonia*, and *Recent Discoveries in Babylonia in Contemporary Review*, January, 1897; Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*.

[†] See Gen. X. 10, 11.

place to the Semites, the priestly class retained and even increased its authority, imposing its highly developed religious system upon the conquerors. Thus it came to pass that, while the military class was, for the most part, Semitic, and spoke a Semitic language, the priestly class was Turanian and spoke a Turanian language. Hence there arose a condition of things similar to that which existed in Europe in the Middle Age, when the clergy, the sole repositories of learning,* used one language, and the other classes another. The result was the same in both cases, a separation between religious and secular life, and the growth of a purely sacerdotal religion, consisting of rites, mysteries, and mysterious doctrines, unintelligible to the people generally, but investing the priesthood with awesome dignity and power, capable of being used to the detriment of the state, or of individuals. Perhaps nowhere in the world did official superstition ever flourish so luxuriantly as in Babylonia. But Babylonian superstition had two sides, an exoteric, consisting of rites and prayers and accessible to everybody, and an esoteric, forming a kind of fanciful philosophy, which functioned with persons instead of ideas, and was closely related to astrology. This was confined to the priests alone,† who unquestionably endeavored to construct for themselves a “System of the Universe” satisfactory to reason, as in

* It must always be borne in mind that all ancient, as well as all mediæval, science relates to the invisible, the sphere of religion. Even Greek science (*ἐπιστήμη*) is no exception to this rule.

† In nearly all oriental religions, including the Greek, there are these two sides. See even Mark IV. 11, and cf. Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 91 seq., 141 seq. Babylonian esotericism lies at the basis, not only of Gnosticism, Pantheism, and Manicheism, but also of the entire mediæval astronomico-ethical system of the universe, so wonderfully set forth in Dante's great poem. On Esotericism see Max Müller, *Theosophy, or Psychological Religion*, pp. 327 seq., where there is some exaggeration.

them developed. Thus they produced a kind of science, which, though mainly fanciful, barred the way for real science for thousands of years.*

From what has been said, it is not difficult to divine the nature of Assyro-Babylonian education. It was priestly; it was imparted in regular schools connected with the temples; it related chiefly to the unseen; it was hostile to true education. Yet it included many subjects, and carried some of them to considerable perfection—reading, writing, arithmetic, astronomy, music, literature, philology, architecture, painting, sculpture, worship, divination, medicine, history, chronology, geography, natural science, and ethics. The first two, owing to the clumsy and complicated nature of the cuneiform script, were very difficult, and must have demanded much time and patience. Besides, writing upon soft clay cannot have been easy to learn. Some of this writing is so fine that it can be read only under a microscope, and must have been written under one.† The astronomy of the Assyro-Babylonians was very advanced, and seems to imply the use of the telescope;‡ but it was pursued mainly for astrological purposes, for casting horoscopes, etc. They invented the signs of the Zodiac, named many of the constellations, and were able to predict eclipses of the moon. Of their music we know but little; but we are sure that, like all Semites, they were fond of it, and played on many instruments. Their literature, consisting chiefly of epic and lyric poetry of a religious character, was marked by sublimity, and must have exerted a power-

* See previous note.

† A lens of considerable power has been found at Nimrud (Calah). See Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. I., pp. 390 seq.

‡ See Rawlinson, *ut sup.*, Vol. II., p. 578.

ful influence on education. The existence of an ancient priestly language, alongside the ordinary spoken Semitic, rendered philology, the study of language and its rules, a necessity; and we shall perhaps not err if we assume that the Babylonians and Assyrians were the earliest grammarians and lexicographers. Indeed, we possess rudimentary clay grammars and lexicons from their hands. Literature was, indeed, a profession, exercised by the priests, who were also the archivists and librarians. Babylonia enjoys the credit of having established the earliest libraries. There seems to have been one in every city, and a famous one, in early times, at Sippara (Heb. Sephervaim), the city of the Sun, perhaps a sort of university town, like the Egyptian On or Heliopolis, and the Palestinian Kirjath-Sepher (Book-town) in pre-Hebrew days.* The architecture, sculpture, and painting of the Assyro-Babylonians evinced great technical skill, but never rose above a prosaic naturalism or colossality, and never showed any appreciation of perspective or artistic unity. Their medicine, divination, and worship were mainly magical rites, digested into elaborate and imposing systems. Their history consisted mostly of annals, kept for thousands of years with scrupulous care, and arranged according to a chronology of remarkable accuracy. Their geographical and ethnological knowledge was as wide as their empire, and is fairly represented in the tenth chapter of Genesis.† Their natural history included mineralogy, botany, and zoology,

* Sippara and Sepher are obviously allied. There can be little doubt that the Hebrew *Sopherim* (see p. 78) had their prototypes in Babylonia. On Kirjath-sepher see Sayce, *Egypt of the Hebrews*, pp. 67 seq.

† See Rawlinson, *The Origin of Nations*, Pt. II., and Schrader, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Old Test.*, Vol. I., pp. 61-103.

in all of which they showed considerable proficiency. Their ethics was closely related to their religion, and revolved round the notion of sin or transgression, which seems to have originated with them, and according to which evil acts are judged, not as expressions of character, or as affecting human beings, but as offences against unseen powers.* Hence no distinction was made between moral and ceremonial delinquencies, or between delinquencies and errors. In all cases the ethical motive was craven fear, which lay like a dead weight upon men whom superstition had convinced of their utter unworthiness and helplessness in the presence of irresponsible gods. Such ethics produced their natural results—fanatic religiosity and superstitious observance coupled with every species of vice—incontinence, cruelty, treachery. It is never safe to deprive the human being of his sense of dignity and nobility, by making him feel himself the slave of any capricious power, seen or unseen, however sublime. Thus the Assyro-Babylonians, though contributing many and important elements to material civilization, stand as a warning to the world, of how little such civilization contributes to human well-being, when not resting on a moral basis. Jeremiah might well prophesy: "Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling-place for jackals, an astonishment and an hissing, without an inhabitant" (LI., 37).

The civilization of the Assyro-Babylonians, like that of the Egyptians, was transmitted to Europe by the Phœni-

* It seems probable that the abject sense of sin, so prominent in many of the Babylonian penitential psalms, was the result of the terrorism which the Turanian priests exercised over the Semitic warriors, and by which they were able to maintain their own authority. Muhammad used the same means with the same result.

cians, Greeks, and Hebrews—the arts by the first, the thought by the second, the religion by the third. Of the education of the last two peoples we shall speak further. This would be the place to speak of the education of the Phœnicians, if we had any sufficient knowledge of it. But we have not. We merely know that in religion, mythology, and ideals of life, they resembled the Babylonians; that they were cruel, luxurious, and lascivious; and that, more than any people of the ancient world, they devoted themselves to commerce and manufacture.* For many ages they were the great purveyors and colonizers of the ancient world. As a result of this, the world owes them two things, the science of navigation and a phonetic alphabet. The antecedents of the latter are very doubtful. Some have sought for them in the hieroglyphs of Egypt, others in the cuneiform script of Babylon, others again in the writing of the Hittites.† The important things to note here are that the Phœnicians, like the Egyptians, wrote from right to left, and that they wrote only consonants. It was reserved for the Greeks to add the vowels, and so produce a perfectly phonetic alphabet, which has become the basis of all European alphabets.

(C) ANCIENT ÂRYAN EDUCATION

Proud in their conquering might, those tribes called themselves “Ârya,” or “Noble,” a term denoting the contempt they felt for the dark-skinned races they found in possession of the land.—FRAZER, *Literary Hist. of India*, p. 2.

* See Isaiah XXIII.; Ezek. XXVIII., and cf. Robertson Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, pp. 26 seq.; Pietschmann, *Die Phönicier*, throughout; Lindsay, *History of Merchant Shipping and Ancient Commerce*.

† For the latest views see Delitzsch, *Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems*, pp. 221–31; Conder, *The Hittites and Their Language*, *passim*.

The Âryans, the third and last of the races that have borne the torch of culture, seem to have risen from savagery to barbarism on the steppes of Southern Russia. Here, in the midst of a rich vegetation, and with a climate neither too severe nor too mild, they pastured their herds, and sowed their crops for many ages. They were acquainted with many domestic animals, and several fruit-trees and cereals. They lived in house-communities, sibs, or clans, presided over by fathers or chiefs, and entertained great affection for their homes and hearths. Being, as agriculturists, dependent on the weather and the seasons, they revered especially the powers supposed to control these—Sky, Sun, Moon, Wind, Fire, etc. Their gods being thus gods of order and measurement, and neither gloomy nor capricious, they themselves became early accustomed to calm reflection and calculation.

About the *names* of these gods we know very little. Unlike the Semites, who seized wholes at a glance, and only gradually analyzed them, the Âryans seized details and gradually combined them into wholes, thus arriving at universal laws and law-givers. These law-givers, or gods, formed, like themselves, a family more or less harmonious, under a father or chief, and the world governed by them, instead of being a scene of miracle and caprice, came to appear as an ordered whole, whose ways might be foreseen and taken advantage of. Thus the Âryans had, from an early period, a distinct bent toward science and philosophy and away from theology. While the Semites explained the world as the miraculous creation of gods or a god, the Âryans explained it as the result of an evolution, in the course of which the gods themselves came

into being.* If their relations to nature became in this way rational and calculated, so did their relations to their fellow-men. Compelled, for agricultural reasons, to adopt more or less settled abodes, they insured the safety of themselves, their crops, and their herds, by erecting fortifications and entering into agreements with their neighbors. In this way they developed that political talent in which they excel all other peoples. While the Semites tended to theocracy, faith, and ritual, the Âryans tended to civicism, science, and ethical practice. To the Semites we owe the Church; to the Âryans, the State. ✓✓✓

At a period not long antedating the dawn of recorded history, large numbers of Âryans, under tried chiefs, spread East and West, over lands previously occupied by Turanian and Semitic culture, and much further. They appear later as Hindus, Iranians (Medes and Persians), Kelts, Germans, Greeks, Latins, Slavs. In fact, they overran nearly the whole of Europe and a large part of Asia. Most of their political foundations belong to the period of civicism; but there are two which may fairly be assigned to that of barbarism—India and Iran. In the former they mingled with a Turanian people, who had never undergone Semitic influence; in the latter, they found a culture compounded of Turanian and Semitic elements. In both cases, they settled in the midst of a culture higher than their own. ~~~~~

* With the Babylonian Creation-epic (G. Smith, *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, Chap. V.) and the first chapter of *Genesis* cf. *Rig-Veda* (Müller's *Hist. of Ancient Sanskrit Lit.*, p. 564), Hesiod's *Theogony*, and the Eddic *Völuspá*. On Primitive Âryanism generally see O. Schrader, *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Âryan Peoples*; Max Müller, *Biographies of Words and the Home of the Âryas*, chaps. VI, VII; Van den Gheyn, *L'Origine Européenne des Âryas*.

(1) *India*

India was governed by priests, and the weal of the nation was sacrificed with reckless indifference.—GARBE, *The Monist*, 1892, p. 50.

The Hindu enters this world as a stranger; all his thoughts are directed to another world; he takes no part even where he is driven to act, and when he sacrifices his life it is but to be delivered from it. No wonder that a nation like the Indian cared so little for history; no wonder that social and political virtues were little cultivated, and the ideas of the Useful and the Beautiful scarcely known to them.—MAX MÜLLER, *History of Ancient Sanskrit Lit.*, p. 18.

Some four thousand years ago, bands of Âryans from the northwest entered the Panjâb, and thence gradually spread themselves over the plains of India, occupied by races already in process of decay. They had already, in the Panjâb, reached a considerable degree of organization, under military chiefs, and had a considerable hymn-literature of religious import, recited by priests, a class which had already risen to prominence. Their gods were the powers of nature, conspicuous among which was Agni, the Fire, the heaven-descended divinity of the domestic hearth.* They appear to have been a proud, vigorous, serious people, without gloom or frivolity, but with a contempt for weakness and inaction. Soon after their settlement, however, their environment began to tell upon them. Accustomed to an invigorating climate and manly exercises, they found it hard to adapt themselves to the debilitating climate and inertia of their new home. Under the influence of these and of the gloomy, brooding

* See Frazer, *Literary History of India*, pp. 41 seq.

religion of the conquered peoples,* they lost their force of will, and sank slowly into a condition of weariness, sensitiveness, and half-morbid dreaminess. Religion, in the sense of anxiety about the life to come, now became their chief concern, and, no longer delighting in activity, they were fain to picture that life as a condition of complete and enduring rest. The visible world became unreal to them in proportion as the invisible world became real.† Under these circumstances it followed naturally that, while the warrior class sank into a secondary position, the priestly class rose to the first rank, and, being honored in idleness, cast contempt upon those who had to labor. Thus the Âryans were divided up into three classes, or castes: (1) the priestly Brahmins; (2) the warrior Kshatriyas; (3) the agricultural Vaiśyas. Below all these were the Śūdras, or servile conquered population.

The Brahmins were not only the priests, but also the scholars, of the Hindus. To them belonged all learning (Veda) and the sole right to instruct their fellow-men in things supernatural and invisible. Their learning consisted in the ability to recite the ancient national religious hymns, which, in course of time, had come to be regarded as divinely inspired, to perform the numerous sacrifices, and intone the numerous prayers and charms, in which divine worship consisted. Such learning might be imparted to any of the Âryan castes; but the Śūdras were forbidden, on pain of death, to appropriate any part of it.

The Veda, which forms the basis of all Hindu education and literature, has come down to us in the form of four manuals, three of which correspond to as many or-

* Frazer, *ut sup.*, pp. 64 seq.

† Max Müller, *Hist. of Ancient Sanskrit Lit.*, pp. 18 seq.

ders of Brahmanic priests—the *Rig-Veda* to the *Hotar*, who invites the gods to the sacrificial feast; the *Sâma-Veda* to the *Udgâtar*, who prepares and presents the soma-juice or other offering, and the *Yajur-Veda* to the *Adhvaryu*, who performs the sacrificial act. The Brahman who superintends the whole must know all these three Vedas; and the fourth, or *Atharva-Veda*, instead of being his manual, is rather the Veda of the Kshatriyas and furnishes the rules for domestic worship, births, weddings, deaths, sicknesses, etc. Each Veda, again, consists of three elements (1) *samhitâ*, that is, collections of verses, songs, or sacrificial formulas; (2) *brâhmanam*, or instruction in the use of the *samhitâ*; (3) *sûtram*, or compendious statement of the contents of the *brâhmanas*, made in order to assist the memory, and form the basis of explanation. The *brahmanas*, again, consist of three elements (1) *vidhi*, or prescription; (2) *athravâda* or explanation, and (3) *vedânta* (veda-end), or philosophical reflection.* It is out of this last that all the systems of Hindu philosophy have sprung. Looking back over the contents of the Veda, as they arise in the order of time, we can trace the whole development of Hindu thought from the early pastoral hymns addressed to the powers of nature—fire, sky, wind, etc.—up to the most abstruse and empty conceptions and formulas in which the unscientific mind seeks to grasp that indefinite something which it supposes to lie behind all the variety of the world and of thought, and to condition both. And this leads us to consider the determining aim of Indian education.

This aim changed from period to period. In ancient times, when the military class was dominant, education

* See Deussen, *Das System des Vedanta*, pp. 5-12.

had reference largely to this life, though the people were not without the hope of another, with the fathers and gods hereafter. In the hymns of the Rig-Veda, there is not a shadow of pessimism, or weariness, or brooding over death, but everywhere a breath of victorious vigor and confidence. The people pray to Agni (Fire) to carry the souls of the deceased to the Home of the Fathers, there to enjoy bliss.* Gradually we find the priestly influence appearing in the belief that Agni is the bridge between men and gods, and that the more a man sacrifices through Agni, the more sure is he to go to the gods and to become like them. As the priests were the sacrificers, they naturally gained in power and wealth as the sacrifices increased, until they came to surpass the military chiefs and kings in the estimation of the people, who now, under their influence, turned their thoughts to the life beyond the grave, and tried to imagine its conditions. Thus there arose an elaborate doctrine of the destiny of the good and the evil, and in connection therewith an elaborate sacrificial system, occupying the chief place in life. But matters did not stop here. Brooding reflection, once started, and combined with the growing desire for rest, gradually made men feel an aversion both to the practices by which heaven might be gained, and to that heaven itself, with its continued activities and stimulating phenomena. Hereupon they began to look forward with pleasure to the emancipation of the individual soul from the delusion of phenomena and of multiple selfhood, and the reemerging of it in the general soul,† now regarded as the sole reality. Hence, serious and

* Frazer, *Lit. Hist. of India*, pp. 38 seq., 124 seq.

† Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, XLVII.

pious men, after having duly performed their part as sons, husbands, fathers, and citizens, began to retire into the forest, to prepare, by self-abnegation and meditation, for this emancipation. In consequence of this, there sprang up the notion of a twofold bliss, one temporal and the other eternal. The former, attainable through pious deeds and sacrifice, brought men after death, by the circuitous "path of the fathers," to the starry heaven of the fathers, where, under the supreme lord, they enjoyed the reward of their deeds and afterward returned for renewed life on earth. The latter, attainable only by meditation and grace, enabled men to realize, and attain complete identity with, the supreme and universal being, a condition of unconscious bliss from which there was no return. This higher bliss gradually became the aim of all earnest men, and the life of India was gradually modified with a view to its attainment. The phenomenal world, with its duties, activities, and enjoyments, now became a delusive dream, from which it was man's chief, or only, duty to free himself, while the invisible world became the all-in-all of reality.

The roots of this tendency are present in all people who deify the powers of nature without completely personifying and individuating them. The gods so created remain diffused and vague, and, when man conceives himself as of their nature—as breath or spirit, for example—his conception of himself is equally vague. Observing, moreover, that natural powers and elements pass readily into each other, he comes to believe that all things, himself included, are but modifications of one primal, indefinite substance, which thus becomes the

sole reality, while all the modifications or determinations are mere transitory, restless phenomena. When, in decadence, he grows weary and longs for rest, this longing takes the form of a desire to return out of phenomenality and multiplicity into the indistinction of the first substance. Such is the origin of all world-despising mysticism and asceticism.

The decadent Hindus suffered in this way: they longed to get away from the restlessness of the changing world. One might suppose that, under the circumstances, they would have committed suicide; but this seemed to them to offer no release. Owing probably to contact with the conquered races, they had come to believe, not only in the immortality of souls, but in their repeated reincarnation, and so the great question for them came to be, how to put a stop to this process. The answer was: By abstaining, as far as possible, from all action, all desire, all thought, and concentrating attention on that perfectly undefined, and therefore undivided, being that lies behind these. When one has fully recognized that he is identical with this universal being, he is safe from metempsychosis (*samsāra*), and attains to redemption (*moksha*). "The question of the possibility of redemption from individual existence, which forms the central point of the Vedānta, as well as of all other Indian systems, presupposes the pessimistic conviction that all individual existence is suffering. This view, indeed, is occasionally expressed in the Veda, as well as in the system itself; though it by no means receives the emphasis that might be expected. How then is redemption from the bond of existence possible? Not by works; for these, the good as well as

the evil, demand their retribution, and therefore condition a new existence, causing a continuation of *samsāra*. Not by (moral) purgation (*samskāra*); for such is possible only in the case of an object capable of change, whereas the *âtman*, the soul, whose redemption is in question, is unchangeable. Hence redemption cannot consist in becoming anything, or in performing anything, but in the recognition of something already existing, but hidden through ignorance. *Salvation comes of recognition*. When the soul has recognized itself as brahman, redemption immediately ensues; recognition of identity with brahman and identification with the soul of the universe follow simultaneously." *

Redemptive recognition of self as brahman is something that cannot be attained by effort; it depends upon the grace of the brahman itself. Man can only clear the way for its manifestation, and this he may do (I.) by the study of the Veda, (II.) by conforming to the four demands, which are, (1) to distinguish eternal from non-eternal substance, (2) to renounce all hope of reward, here and hereafter, (3) to attain the six means—(a) mental calm, (b) self-control, (c) self-abnegation, (d) patient endurance, (e) collectedness, (f) faith—(4) to desire redemption. Roughly speaking, we may say that the means conducive to knowledge are two: (I.) Works, (II.) Meditation. Works have an ascetic purpose, and are not meritorious; they include not only the "six means," but also such preparatory practices as sacrifice, almsgiving, penance, fasting. Meditation is devotional reflection on the words of the Vedic scriptures, and must, like threshing, be continued until the

* Deussen, *System des Vedānta*, pp. 510 seq.

grain of knowledge—the direct intuition that the soul is identical with brahman—is separated from the straw of error, the belief in the reality of the world and of transmigration, of works, and of enjoyment. The soul that has attained to knowledge is free from all delusion; its body vanishes and, with it, all activity, pain, and pleasure; hence, of course, all moral law. The germ of works is destroyed, so that no further birth into a phenomenal world is possible, and the perfected soul only awaits the moment of death to return into the supreme brahman and be one with it.*

Such is the essence of Brahmanism. Buddhism, which is a sort of reformed Brahmanism, dating from about B.C. 500, merely carried the older religion to its logical conclusions.† It abolished, as delusion, the caste-system and the distinction between Âryans and Śūdras, it declared the active life to be unnecessary as a preparation for the contemplative; it emphasized the pain inseparable from all individual existence; it winged enthusiasm for eternal rest in nothingness (*nirvana*). Its founder, the Sākya prince, Siddārtha, was not a Brahman, but a Kshatriya, reared in a district where brahmanic teaching was greatly modified by contact with older native religions. This fact accounts for its attitude toward Brahmanism. Buddhism flourished for a time in India; but it was gradually extirpated by the older and more human Brahmanism, and forced to seek refuge in Nepal, Ceylon, Further India, China, and Japan, where it has still many millions of adherents.

Considering the ideal of Indian life, we can have no /x

* Deussen, *ut sup.*, pp. 510-14.

† It first became popular under Asoka, about 260 B.C.

difficulty in realizing the character of the corresponding education. It was wholly ethical and ascetic. The world, being regarded as a delusion, was, of course, considered unworthy of serious attention; hence, there was no science. Self-discipline was the sole study, and this, it must be admitted, gave occasion to some attractive virtues, especially under Buddhism—sympathy, gentleness, endurance, unworldliness, etc. It is easy and common, however, to misunderstand and overestimate these. After all, Buddhism and, to a large extent, Brahmanism, are “systems of organized weariness,” not to say of cowardice, or dread of pain; hence, all the virtues of the two great Indian religions rest upon a foundation of cowardice, and aim only at unconditional sloth, entailing the loss of the moral individuality. Under such circumstances, India, of course, never rose to the civic grade of culture, but, with all her subtle thought and gentle virtues, remained in a condition of unfreedom, of glorified barbarism, which gradually degenerated into a lower condition still, until she fell an easy prey, first to the Muslim and then to the Christian.

(2) *Iran (Medo-Persia)*

Prometheus comes to examine the whole troupe, and finds all the other animals duly provided for, but man without clothes, shoes, lair, or arms, and the fated day approaching when he must emerge, as man, from the earth into the light. Prometheus, being at his wits' end as to how to preserve man alive, steals the artistic deftness of Hephæstus and Athena, along with fire—for without fire it could not possibly have been acquired by anyone, or been of any use—and so presents it to man. In this way man came into possession of the useful arts, but lacked political wisdom, for that

lay with Zeus, and Prometheus was not yet permitted to enter the acropolis, the abode of Zeus.—PLATO, *Protagoras*, 321 D.

It is clear that, in the view and intention of the Avesta, the priests formed a closed caste.—SPIEGEL, *Eran. Alterthumsk.*, III., 567.

A king sat on the rocky brow
That looks o'er sea-born Salamis.
While ships in thousands lay below
And men in nations : all were his.
He counted them at break of day,
And, when the sun set, where were they ?

—BYRON.

The Iranians and Indians are the two divisions of the Asiatic Âryans. The two must have lived together long after they parted with the European Âryans. Their languages* are very closely related, and so are their original mythologies, manners, and customs. When we first hear of the Iranians, it is under the name of Medes.† Their scattered tribes were conquered in 835 B.C. by Shalmanezer, and subsequently by two of his successors, thus becoming subject to Assyria. In this condition they adopted much of the civilization of their Semitic conquerors, including several of their gods, and their priestly caste, the Magi, which, as we have seen, the Assyrians had, through the Babylonians, borrowed from the Turanian Sumiro-Akkadians. Asur, the chief god of the almost monotheistic Assyrians, they borrowed under the name of Ahura‡ (usually lengthened

* It is through a gross misunderstanding that the Iranian language has been called Zend. *Zend* means commentary !

† Heb. Madai. See Gen. X., where Madai occurs along with Gomer, Magog (Magi ?), Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. The Persians are not yet named separately.

‡ It is usually assumed that Ahura is but the Persian form of the Indian (Sanskrit) Asura, identified with Varuna; but this view seems to me

into Ahura-Mazda, Ormazd). Thus in the eighth century B.C. the Iranians had a religion composed of Turanian (Magian), Semitic (monotheistic), and Âryan (vedic) elements. In the last quarter of that century, the second of these elements was greatly strengthened by the importation into Media of a large number of Israelitish exiles* (722 B.C.), who having, under prophetic influence, become monotheists, found no difficulty in identifying their own Yahweh with the Median Ahura (Asur), thus elevating the ideal of the latter. It was in all probability due to the influence of the same exiles that the Medes soon after became a powerful nation, so that, in 606 B.C., they were able, with the help of the Babylonians, to overthrow the Assyrian capital, Nineveh, and establish a kingdom of their own. It must have been about the same time that a band of them marched southward into Semitic lands and founded the kingdom of Persia, in what was formerly, in part at least, Elam.† In less than a century after these events there occurred a great religious movement, which is most easily explained as due to Israelitish influence‡ —Mazdeism, whose reputed founder was the Median Zarathushtra (Zoroaster),§ and which clearly contains

beset with insurmountable objections, that cannot be enumerated here. It certainly fails to account for the Iranian monotheism.

* 2 Kings XVII. 6, XVIII. 9. Sargon boasts that he carried away 27,280 of them on this occasion. See Schrader, *Cuneif. Inscriptions*, Vol. I., p. 264 (Eng. Trans.).

† "Elam is by no means . . . equivalent to Persia. We never meet with the name 'Persia' or 'Persian' before the time of Cyrus, either on an Assyrian or a Babylonian monument."—Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscript.*, Vol. I., p. 96 (Eng. Trans.).

‡ See Darmesteter, *Zend-Avesta*, Pt. I., pp. lvii.-lx. (2d Edit.); Max Müller, *Theosophy*, pp. 48 seq.

§ The various dates assigned to Zarathushtra vary by more than 4,000 years. The truth seems to be that, while the Mazdean movement dates from the sixth century B.C., its putative founder is a legendary hero of very remote date. (See Jackson, *Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran*,

Turanian, Semitic, and Âryan elements. How far the reform attributed to Zoroaster affected the Medo-Persian religion in pre-Hellenic times is by no means clear,* but it is certain that the religion of Ahura, a potential monotheism, was the faith of the Persian kings from the time of Darius I. (521-485 B.C.).† We must say "potential," because, thanks to the Turanian Magian‡ element in it, it was, outwardly, a physical and moral dualism. Over against Ahura-Mazda, the power of light and good, it placed Anglo-Mainyus, the power of darkness and evil, and made the world the scene of their conflict. This introduced the ceremonial distinction between things clean and things unclean, which leads to so much burdensome superstition. The fire-worship, so prominent among the Persians, seems to contain both Turanian and Âryan elements. That a dualistic religion, finding expression in fire-worship, should have been the parent of any very lofty moral ideas is highly improbable. Nor, indeed, do we find

pp. 149-78; Windischmann, *Zoroastrische Studien*, pp. 44-56, 260-313; Darmesteter, *Zend-Avesta*, Pt. I., pp. lxvii.-lix. It was common in those days to seek prestige for religious systems by attributing them to ancient heroes. That the Jews ascribed Mazdeism to Israelitish influence is clear from Daniel II. 48 (cf. Ezek. XIV. 14, 20) and Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, Bk. X., cxx. x. xj.

* Herodotus does not allude to Zoroaster, nor does his name occur in any Persian inscription. He was known to the Greeks in the age before Alexander: more we cannot safely affirm.

† See the famous Behistun inscription, Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus*, Vol. II., pp. 490-514. There is nothing to show that Cyrus the Great, the founder of the Persian Empire, was a worshipper of Ahura. On his recently discovered cylinder, he is spoken of as an Elamite and as a worshipper of Marduk and other Babylonian deities. See Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Monuments*, pp. 138 seq. It may well be that the legend which connects Zoroaster with Hystaspes (Vistāshpa), and the latter with the father of Darius, points to the fact that the worship of Ahura by the Persian kings dates from about Darius's time.

‡ On the Turanian origin of Magism see Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions*, Vol. II., pp. 110-15; Spiegel, *Iran. Alterth.* Vol. III., pp. 585 seq.

any such among the ancient Iranians. There are, to be sure, ideas of wonderful moral reach in certain parts of the Avesta (the Bible of Iran); but that work, in the form in which we now possess it, dates from the third century of our era, the rise of the Sassanids; and the parts in question, particularly the gâthâs, or psalms, long supposed to be the most ancient parts of it, clearly show the influence of Greek philosophy* and even of Christianity. The fact, then, is that the Iranians, when they settle down to form states, are an Âryan people, who have already largely adopted two older forms of culture, the Turanian and the Semitic, and been deeply influenced by them, without rising greatly above them. And this is shown in their education. Formerly we were wont to draw our notions of Persian education from Xenophon's *Cyropædia*; but we now know that that work in a mere edifying, tendentious romance, intended to recommend to the Athenians the Spartan type of education. In spite of this, it contains a certain amount of truth, as we see from a comparison of the account of Herodotus (I., 131 sqq.), parts of which are here subjoined:

“The Persians consider it improper to erect statues, temples, or altars, and even censure those who do so—I suppose because they do not conceive the gods in the form of men, as the Greeks do. They are wont to ascend the loftiest mountains and perform sacrifices to Zeus, calling by that name the whole vault of heaven. They sacrifice also to the sun, the moon, earth, fire,

* See translation of the Avesta by Darmesteter and Mills, in *Sacred Books of the East*. With Vol. III. (Mills), pp. XVIII–XXV. cf. Vol. I. (2d Edit., Darmesteter), pp. xxx. sqq., lxiv. sqq.

water, and the winds. To these alone they sacrificed originally; but they have learned, in addition, from the Assyrians and Arabians, to sacrifice to Urania. The Assyrians call Aphrodite, Mylitta; the Arabians, Alitta; the Persians, Mitra.*

“They are greatly given to wine† . . . and are wont to deliberate about the most important matters when they are drunk. The resolution which they have reached in this way, the master of the house in which the deliberation has taken place lays before them again on the following day, when they are sober; and if, in this condition, it pleases them, they adopt it; otherwise, they drop it. Likewise, whatever they resolve upon when sober they reconsider when drunk.

“When they meet each other in the streets, one can distinguish whether any two persons meeting are of the same rank or not. If they are, then, instead of greeting each other, they kiss each other on the mouth; if one is a little inferior to the other, they kiss each other on the cheeks; whereas, if the one is much less noble than the other, he falls down and worships him. Of all peoples, they honor—next, of course, to themselves—most highly those who dwell nearest to them, then those who live next to these, and so on. . . .

“They adopt foreign manners more readily than any other people. For example, thinking the Median dress superior to their own, they have adopted it; and in war they wear Egyptian breastplates. They practise all sorts of luxury they hear of. . . . Each man marries many lawful wives and, besides these, maintains a

* This is a mistake, one of several in this account.

† Soma or homa?

still larger number of concubines. Next to courage in battle, the highest mark of manliness is supposed to be a host of children. To the man who can show the largest number the king annually sends gifts. They think strength lies in numbers. They instruct their children, between the ages of five and twenty, in only three things—horsemanship, archery, and truth-telling. Up to the age of five, the child does not come into its father's presence, but passes its time in the harem—the purpose being that, if it dies in infancy, it may cause the father no grief. This custom I deem praiseworthy, and so, likewise, this other, that even the king does not put anyone to death on account of a single fault, and that no other Persian subjects any of his slaves to irremediable punishment for a single fault. It is not till after he has weighed the bad deeds of his slave against his good deeds that the master gives vent to his anger. They maintain that no one ever murdered his own parent; that if such a case happened, the children, upon inquiry, were always found to be either changelings or bastards. They say it is not likely that the real parent should die by the hand of his child. What they are not allowed to do, they are not allowed to speak of. In their estimation, the basest thing is to lie, and the next basest, to be in debt—and this for many reasons, but especially because (they say) the debtor must tell some sort of lie. . . . They do not . . . spit or wash their hands in rivers, or permit anyone else to do so, but have the greatest reverence for them. . . . The corpse of a Persian is not buried until it has been torn to pieces by a bird or a dog. I know for certain that the Magians do this;

for they do it publicly. Covering the body with wax, the Persians inter it. The Magians differ widely from other men, and even from the Egyptian priests. The latter make it a point of conscience to kill no animal but the victims for sacrifice, whereas the Magians, with their own hands, kill everything but dogs and men, making a great virtue of this, and killing, in like manner, ants and snakes, creeping and winged things."

Nothing is more striking than the wide difference that prevails between the Iranians and their Indian brethren. This we may believe to be due to two causes: (1) that the Iranians were never subjected to the influence of a debilitating climate, like that of India, (2) that they mingled with Semitic peoples, which the Indians did not. Owing to the former, the warrior class remained superior to the priestly;* owing to the latter, the Iranian religion tended to monotheism, and not to pantheism. Ahura-Mazda was, plainly, the god of the warrior-class, that is, of the Semitized Âryans.† As a consequence of this, Persian education was military, or knightly, and not priestly, although, no doubt, the foreign priestly class had its own education, including astrology, divination, medicine, literature, etc.‡

Barbarism reached its highest expression among the Iranians, and especially among the Persians.§ We find

* Another reason for this was that the Magian priests, not being Âryans, were kept in an inferior position. Once, after the death of Cyrus's son, Cambyses, the Magians did attempt to capture the government; but they were speedily put down by Darius (521). See Herod., III., 61 seq. Cf. Spiegel, *Iran. Alterthumsk.*, III., 567. The Magi are not mentioned in the Avesta.

† Cf. Spiegel, *ut sup.*, III., 601, who says Mithra.

‡ See Spiegel, *ut sup.*, III., 581 seq.

§ The Greeks frequently used the terms "Mede" and "Persian" indiscriminately. The Median empire lasted from B.C. 606 to 538, when Cyrus put an end to it and founded the Persian empire. In the *Prometheia* of

among them a certain Promethean virtue and greatness of soul, of which Cyrus is the best embodiment; but two things still weigh upon them, preventing them from rising to civic culture and artistic freedom—a despotic form of government and an hereditary priesthood. Both these have to be overcome ere civicism can be realized.*

Æschylus, Prometheus is meant to embody barbarian culture, while Zeus stands for the civic culture of Greece. See quotation from Plato, p. 66.

* See Herod., III., 31, and cf. Spiegel, *Iran. Alterthumskunde*, Vol. III., pp. 606 seq.

CHAPTER V.

CIVIC EDUCATION

Now, lo, if he beget a son, that seeth all his father's sins, which he hath done, and feareth, and doeth not such like, . . . he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live.—EZEKIEL.

The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.—JESUS.

The history of humanity is a progress in the consciousness of freedom.—HEGEL.

In savagery, men, grouped into small communities by the blood tie, having but a meagre experience and a beggarly world, and, being unskilled in the processes of abstraction and generalization, are almost entirely the slaves of natural needs and supernatural fears. In barbarism, organized into larger communities, with a more varied experience, new discoveries, and division of social functions, they attain a certain freedom from their needs and fears by establishing special institutions to deal with these. The producing class provides against hunger; the military, against visible attacks; the sacerdotal, against invisible injury from the supernatural. The price paid for this freedom is complete subordination to the system of these institutions. Thus, men free themselves from servitude to nature and supernature by subjecting themselves to conventional

institutions. In the barbarian stage of culture these are all-powerful, and the individual is entirely submerged in the nation, which is the moral personality. Accordingly, the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children; the curse of crime descends from generation to generation; nay, the sin of the father of mankind taints the whole race.

As men ascend above barbarism, their progress is marked by a gradual emancipation from institutions, or a gradual development of individualism. Institutions do not, indeed, disappear, any more than did nature when they arose; but man now slowly becomes master of them, and rises to self-direction under institutions, that is, to true, moral freedom. He passes from naïve thought to critical reflection; from conventional estimates of things to rational estimates, on the basis of worth for moral ends; from action determined by status to action determined by reflection and contract. He now sets up individual ideals—the saint, the hero, the philosopher, the citizen—and tries to realize them in life and in art. Having now, for the first time, something of his own to express, he expresses it in forms which give him delight, that is, in forms of beauty. Recognizing himself to be an original source of action, and not a mere puppet in the hands of higher powers, he claims personal* immortality, and builds himself splendid ideals of eternal existence—a life in heaven with the gods.

Of the three races that have been the bearers of civilization, only two have been able to rise above bar-

* I say "personal," not "individual." Personality is an ethical term, and it is always the ethical attribute that conditions immortality.

barism, the Semitic and the Âryan.* It was, indeed, through their united efforts that the further step to civicism became possible. The peoples that best represent civic culture are the Semitic Jews,† and the Âryan Greeks and Romans, who, in their turn, united to make possible the final, or human, type of culture.

(1) *Judæa*

As a religion of ethical ideas, Judaism produced not schools of philosophy, but schools for youth, in which the growing generation was educated. "Go," said the heathen thinkers to their contemporaries, who wished to weaken Israel, "go to the Jewish schools, in which the children are instructed in the observance of the moral law ! There is the source of their strength, there the secret of their endurance. If you wish to conquer them, attack the schools" (Talmud).—STRASSBERGER, *Gesch. der Erzieh. u. d. Unterr. bei den Israeliten*, p. 33.

The Hebrew people, when it first figures in the pages of the Bible, is at the nomadic and savage stage of culture. From contact with the settled Canaanites it rose, in the days of Saul, David, and Solomon, into a polytheistic barbarism, remaining in that condition as long as it had a national existence. Meanwhile, however, the prophets—Amos, Hoshea, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah‡—had succeeded in raising a portion of their fellow-citizens out of polytheism, through monolatry,

* Unless, indeed, it should prove that the Japanese are capable of taking the step; and this seems probable. If so, however, they will have taken it under combined Semitic and Âryan influence.

† I.e., the post-exilic Jews. The Hebrews before the exile must be classed as barbarians, along with the Phœnicians.

‡ See Robertson Smith, *Prophets of Israel*; Cornill, *Der israel. Prophetismus*; Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel and Judah and Prolegomena zur Gesch. Israels*.

to monotheism, and to an ideal of personal righteousness, as the sacrifice which God demands of men.* Righteousness is the mark of civic culture.

About 621 B.C., a short time before the Babylonish Captivity, King Josiah, under the combined influence of priests and prophets, gave official recognition and effect to the teachings of the latter by the promulgation of a code of laws, which our best critics recognize as, in the main, identical with the book of Deuteronomy.† During the Captivity this book became the programme and bond of union of that "remnant" of the Jews, which sought to remain "the servant of Yahweh" (the Lord), and when, in 458, a portion of these "returned," and, along with their poorer brethren, who had not been carried away, restored the Jewish nation, as a theocratic polity, under the suzerainty of Persia, the book was enlarged, by the addition of other elements, into the "Law" (*Torah*, the Pentateuch), and made the basis of the new institution. The "word of the Lord" being now regarded as closed, no more prophets arose. Their place was taken by the *sopherim*, or scripture-scholars,‡ who devoted themselves to the preservation, interpretation, and teaching of the Law in connection with the different synagogues which arose at this time. Thus came into existence the *beth-hammidrash*,§ or "house of instruction," which did so much for the religious and moral culture of the Jews, but which, at

* See Hoshea VI. 6; Isaiah I. 11-17; and cf. 1 Kings III. 1-3; 2 Kings XXIII.; Amos V. 21 seq.; Psalm L. 8-15.

† See Canon Driver, *Crit. and Exeget. Commentary on Deuteronomy*.

‡ Not "scribes," as our versions have it. See Schürer, *Hist. of the Jews in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II., i., 306-79.

§ See Schürer, *ut sup.*, II., ii., 52-89.

the same time, trained them to a punctilious legal formalism, fatal to free development, and conducive to exclusiveness, dogmatism, and fanaticism.*

It is needless to say that all Jewish instruction had for its subject the Law, and was therefore religious and moral in its character. It set out with the assumption that all important truth had been divinely revealed in the Law, and had only to be understood in order to meet all exigencies. Hence, every line, word, and letter of it was submitted to microscopic investigation, and made to yield a maximum of meaning, sometimes by methods altogether unpermitted. "Later Judaism," says Schürer (II., i., 348), "discovered that there is a fourfold meaning of Scripture, which is indicated by the word פֶּרֶשׁ (pardés, paradise), viz., (1) *peshat*, the simple or literal meaning; (2) *remez* (suggestion), the meaning arbitrarily imported into it; (3) *derush* (investigation), the meaning deduced by investigation; (4) *sod* (mystery), the theosophic meaning." † We need not wonder that "Jewish exegesis . . . degenerated into the most capricious puerilities. From its standpoint, *e.g.*, the transposition of words into numbers, and numbers into words, for the purpose of obtaining the most astonishing disclosures, was by no means strange, and quite in accordance with its spirit." ‡ The result of Scripture-interpretation by these methods has been handed down to us in the Talmud (= instruction),

* See Schürer, *ut sup.*, II., ii., 90-125, and cf. Paul, Ep. to Galatians, III., 19-29.

† Cf. Dante, *Convivio*, II., i., and cf. Letter to Can. Grande, § 7. On the mischievous effect of allegorical interpretation see Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 134-51; Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, pp. 58-85.

‡ Schürer, *ut sup.*, II., i., 348, 349.

or, rather, Talmuds,* which have been the basis of Jewish life and scholarship for many hundred years.†

Jewish education, though defective both in matter and in method, and tending to fetter rather than free the mind, achieved four valuable results: (1) it developed a taste for close, critical study; (2) it sharpened the wits, even to the point of perversity; (3) it encouraged a reverence for law and produced desirable social conduct; and (4) it formed a powerful bond of union among the Jewish people. We need not wonder that it stood high in their estimation, that all studied who could, and that scholars were highly honored. The pupils of the *sopherim* were the Pharisees (*perushim* = Separatists), who in the centuries before Christ came to be sharply distinguished from the Sadducees, or priestly party, on whom the Law sat lightly.‡ When, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the temple worship ceased, the Sadducees disappeared, and Judaism has ever since been represented by the Pharisees, devoted to the study of the Law.§

As to the manner in which instruction was given,

* The *midrashim* of the *sopherim* were of two kinds, *halacha*, or legal deductions from the Law, and *haggada*, or expansion of it in the form of religious and moral legends. In the second century of our era, the former was codified into the Mishna of Judah hannasi, with its sixty (63) tracts. This again became the basis of two Talmuds, the Palestinian (A.D. 350±) and the Babylonian (A.D. 550±), the latter being four times as long as the former and much more complete. Both contain halachic and haggadic elements, and are wonderful, and rather chaotic accumulations of rabbinical subtlety and fancy.

† See Schürer, *ut sup.*, I., i., 119-44; Em. Deutsch, *The Talmud*, in *Literary Remains*.

‡ See Schürer, *ut sup.*, II., ii., 1-43.

§ In its narrower and original sense, the Law is the Pentateuch; but the term is often made to include the later additions made to the Scripture canon—the Prophets, earlier and later, and the Kethubim or Writings (wrongly rendered hagiographa)—in fact the entire Old Testament. See Canon Ryle, *The Old Testament Canon*.

we read: "The master sat at the uppermost place, surrounded by his pupils, like a crown on the head, in order that every pupil might see and hear him. The master did not sit on a stool and the pupils on the ground; but all sat either on stools or on the ground. Formerly it was the custom for the master to sit, and the pupils to stand; but, shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, it was arranged for both pupils and teachers to sit." Instruction was carried on apparently by the dialectic, or conversational, method, and the Talmud enjoins that "the pupils' questions should never become too much for the teacher." * We find a typical example of this method in the *Fons Vitæ* of the Jewish philosopher Ibn Gabirol (Avicbron), who lived in the eleventh century. It is said of Jesus that he was found in the temple, "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions." † Neither teacher nor pupils, it should seem, brought any text-book to the school; both depended upon their memories for the texts to be discussed. "The education for which general provision was made in the schools was primarily and almost exclusively religious in character, and largely the work would be *learning by rote* Biblical verses and the dicta of the rabbis which form the 'oral law' [halacha]. These dicta . . . the reduction of which to writing was prohibited, and the Bible, were the stock in trade of the scholar. The storing of the memory would be the first concern; the

* For the whole of this section, see Spiers, *The School System of the Talmud*, excellently reviewed in *Internat. Jour. of Ethics* for April, 1899, pp. 404-6. STRASSBURGER, *Gesch. der Erziehung und des Unterrichts bei den Israeliten*.

† Luke II. 46.

cultivation of intelligence and acuteness would come somewhat later, and, from a certain point of view, would be of secondary importance. The Talmudic methods* of education have primarily the storing of the memory in view. One of the most interesting and striking features of the Talmudic literature is the keen psychological insight shown by the rabbis.† We can have no clearer exemplification of this insight than the completeness with which they recognized the conditions most favorable for retention, and the skill with which they sought to secure these conditions. They sought to secure the maximum of intensity for the impressions by the simultaneous affection of several senses. The word was not only to be heard, but also spoken and read. Visual, auditory, and muscular memory were all called upon to assist in the retention of the impression. The aid of musical memory, also, was enlisted; for the scholars sang or chanted their lessons. Great insistence was laid upon adequate and constant repetition; and, above all, every device was adopted to secure the full attention of the scholar by rousing his interest. In the case of more advanced scholars, the subject for which they asserted preference was alone to be selected. Of great interest in this connection is the system of mnemonics employed and recommended in the Talmud. The scholars are exhorted to make constant use of symbols, catch-words, and other mnemonic devices. In the tractate 'Shabbath' an interesting description occurs of a lesson on the alphabet. Words are selected of

* It is needless to say that these methods antedate and underlie the Talmud.

† Name replacing the earlier *sopherim*. See Schürer, *ut sup.*, II., i., 315.

which the consecutive letters of the alphabet are the initials,* and the words are grouped in easily remembered phrases conveying some moral injunction. Few would expect to find in the Talmud the prototype of the familiar 'A was an Archer,' etc."† The fact is that Jewish methods of education passed from the Jewish schools of Alexandria into the Christian "catechetical schools," and thence into the schools of the Middle Age and of modern times.

It seems that the *beth-hamidrash* did not concern itself with primary education, which was given at home by the head of the family. Soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, however (A.D. 70), Joshua ben Gamla caused schools for children over six to be established in every town and village, and made attendance compulsory. These schools often sat in the open air, notwithstanding which they were highly appreciated. The compiler of the Mishna said: "The world exists only by the breath of school-children;" and we read in the Talmud, "A town without a school and school-children should be demolished." "Jerusalem was destroyed because there ceased to be schools and school-children there."‡ Such being the attitude of the Jews toward education, we need not wonder that "they searched from Dan to Beersheba, but found not an illiterate person; from Gabath unto Antiphorus, and could discover neither male nor female who was not well acquainted with the laws of the ritual and ceremonial observance."§

* There are even "alphabetical psalms" (9, 10, 25, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145). See Cheyne, *Orig. of Psalter*, pp. 51, 228, etc.

† The prototype of "The House that Jack Built" also occurs in it.

‡ Spiers, *School System of the Talmud*, pp. 1 seq.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Jewish education being religious and moral, great stress was laid upon the character, and especially the piety, of the teachers, and the demeanor of the pupils. Of the former the highest worth and dignity were demanded. Their work was regarded as divine work and themselves almost as divine agents. Neither youthful, unmarried, nor quick-tempered persons were allowed to teach. As to the pupils, the Talmud tells us: "All kinds of work which a servant does for his master, must a pupil do for his instructor, except the taking off and putting on of shoes." The pupils' virtues were modesty, respect, and perseverance. Teachers made every effort to enter into friendly relations with their pupils, and to study their individual characteristics. They arrived at the following generalization, among others: "Four dispositions are found among those who sit for instruction before the wise. They correspond, respectively, to a sponge, a funnel, a strainer, and a sieve; the sponge imbibes all; the funnel receives at one end and discharges at the other; the strainer suffers the wine to pass through, but retains the dregs; and the sieve removes the bran, but retains the flour." Again, a famous rabbi said: "I have learnt much from my teachers, more from my school-fellows, but most of all from my pupils." Such was the spirit of Jewish education.

It is easy to point out defects in this education, narrowness, formalism, virtual hostility to science, self-consciousness, etc.; but, when we consider its effects upon the Jewish people, and how it not only held them together, but enabled them to maintain a struggle of unparalleled severity for two thousand years, and finally brought them out conquerors, we cannot but accord it

our heartiest admiration. It was their solace in the darkest of times, and there is no period which cannot show distinguished rabbis keeping alive the study of the Law and the taste for learning. Thus it came to pass that the Jews were the great purveyors of learning and the chief translators of the Middle Age, and that even to-day many of them count among our most distinguished scholars.*

One lesson, above all, Jewish education has to teach us, viz., that the most important element in all education is moral discipline. The Greek, with his art and his philosophy, and the Roman, with his law and his statesmanship, have vanished from the face of the earth; but the Jew, with his moral discipline, his Torah, and his Talmud, is still with us, as strong and as ready for life's struggle as ever.

It may be well to conclude this section by replying to a possible objection. It may be said that the Jews never founded a free state or rose to civic freedom, whence they ought to rank as barbarians. The answer is that, under the Maccabees, they did found a free state, which lasted over a hundred years (165-63 B.C.); and that, although its theocratic constitution, claiming divine origin, was barbarian in form, it was, in reality, civic, the laws depending for their adoption upon the free moral judgment of the people.† The Jews, like all Semites, place the origin of moral authority outside of themselves;‡ but it does not cease to be moral au-

* See Steinschneider, *Die hebrae. Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*.

† See Nehemiah VIII. It is needless to say that the Law contained in its sacrificial system, demanded by the uncultured masses, remnants of savagery even, as, indeed, was recognized by the great prophets. See Hoshea VI. 6; Isaiah I. 11-17, and cf. Psalm L. 8-15.

‡ See Jerem. XXXI. 33; Ps. LI. 10; cf. Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*.

thority on that account. The practice, however, has this disadvantage, conspicuous enough in Jewish history, that the laws, being regarded as divine, cannot be abrogated or amended, but must be interpreted with subtle and often perverse ingenuity in order to keep pace with the advance of moral judgment. Hence the Talmud. The civic consciousness of the Jews centred in three conceptions: (1) an omnipotent, creator God, who had chosen the Jews as his vicegerents on earth; (2) a Messiah to restore them to this exceptional position, which, through unfaithfulness, they had lost; (3) Holiness on their part, as the condition of this restoration. Thus their supreme ideal took the form of a "kingdom of heaven" upon earth. After the rise of the Maccabees, they came to believe that the citizens of this kingdom would be immortal and that the righteous dead would rise to share in it. It was then for the first time that they began to entertain notions of personal immortality,* and thus to pave the way for the Christian ideal of a kingdom *in* heaven—an ideal in which the three central conceptions of Judaism appear as the three persons of the Trinity.

(2) Greece

To Babylonia, far more than to Egypt, we owe the art and learning of the Greeks. It was from the East, not from Egypt, that Greece derived her architecture, her sculpture, her science, her philosophy, her mathematical knowledge, in a word, her intellectual life.—RAWLINSON, *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. III., p. 76.

Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin.—HENRY SUMNER MAINE.

* Daniel XII. 2, 3; *Book of Enoch* (Charles's Edition), pp. 52, 57, and *passim*.

And what in restless seeming balanceth
Do ye make steady with enduring thoughts.

—GOETHE, *Faust*, Prol. in Heaven, *sab fin.*

Forevermore,
With grander resurrection than was feigned
Of Attila's fierce Huns, the soul of Greece
Conquers the bulk of Persia.

—GEORGE ELIOT, *Spanish Gypsy*.

The Jews, though rising to the civic ideal of individual worth, self-determination, and responsibility, never attained to that of complete moral autonomy. Their law-giving Power and their Law both remained external, being obeyed rather as authorities than as embodiments of reason.* Though the same thing is largely true of the Greeks in the earlier part of their historic career, yet, in course of time, they rose to the higher position. Indeed, it is just this rise that gives them their unique importance in history.

The Greeks, or, as they called themselves, Hellenes, resembled in many respects the Iranians. In prehistoric times, after separating from the other Âryans, they occupied for a considerable period the mountainous regions lying between the steppes of Russia and the plain of Thessaly. Here, divided into several tribes, they led a free, hardy life, developing that courage and that fine physique for which they afterward became so famous, and gradually encroaching upon the country to the south of them. This country, in very ancient times, had been occupied by a tower-building Turanian race, later known as Pelasgians (Pelishtim, Philistines) or Tyrrhenians (Etrurians†)—a race with a gloomy relig-

* See, however, Jerem. XXXI. 33 seq.

† The Greeks always called the Etrurians Tyrrhenians.

ion, embodied in such chthonic deities as Hades, Demeter, Persephone, Dionysus, Castor, and Polydeuces.* At a time near the dawn of history these Pelasgians were conquered and driven into mountainous or barren regions by a number of tribes closely akin to the Phœnicians and Hebrews—Semites who brought with them their Baals and Baalaths: Apollo, Poseidon, Heracles, Ares, Hermes, Cybele, Hera, Athena, Aphrodite, Artemis, etc.† In course of time these tribes united into an empire under the rule of the Pelopids, in the days of the last of whom, Agamemnon, took place the great struggle, called the Trojan war, which greatly enfeebled the nation. Taking advantage of this, the Âryan Hellenes, in three tribes—Æolians, Dorians, and Ionians—came down and conquered it, very much as the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons conquered Britain in the fifth century of our era. It is with this event, which seems to have occurred about 1100–1000 B.C., that Greek history proper begins.

It is generally said that the earliest accounts we have of the Greeks come to us from the Homeric poems; but this is not strictly true. The civilization described by Homer is not Greek, or even Âryan, but Semitic and Turanian. He writes, indeed, in Greek; but his myths and legends, his gods and heroes, are mainly Semitic.‡ The names of the subordinate personages, which he himself invented, have all Greek etymologies; whereas

* All these, but the first, were called by the later Greeks *οἱ μεγάλοι θεοί*, the Great Gods, or, properly, the Old Gods—Kabiri. The Arab. *Kabir* means both great and old. Hades was later called the Pelasgic Zeus.

† These names, which have no etymology in any Âryan language, are easily explainable in Semitic.

‡ I am well aware that this is not the ordinary view; but I feel sure that it is correct.

those of the principal characters, which belonged to the original myths and legends, are plainly Semitic. Moreover, the art-objects found in recent years at Mycenæ, Spata, Menidhi, and other places are at once Homeric and non-Greek. The fact is, the Homeric poems were composed at a time when the civilization of Greece was still mainly Semitic, and only slightly modified by Âryan influence. It took some three hundred years, forming a kind of "dark age," for the two elements to find their proper relations. At the end of that time, the Hellenes had adopted much of the higher civilization of the Semites, especially their gods and religion, but had greatly modified and elevated all, at the same time retaining a distinct social and political superiority, and imposing their language on the whole people.*

The Greeks, then, when, about 800-700 B.C., they began to play a distinct part in history, were an Âryan people, which had, in large degree, adopted and modified an older Semitic civilization, itself containing certain elements borrowed from a still older Turanian culture. As they spread themselves into the mountainous regions they came into direct contact with the Turanians, and were considerably influenced by them.† But everywhere the Hellenic tendency to measure, method, and order made itself felt. About 800 B.C., the Bœotian Hesiod brought order into the chaotic pantheon of Homer by introducing among its members the family

* It is a general rule that, whenever Semites and Âryans combine, the former supply the religion (the supernatural), the latter the art, science, language, and statesmanship (the natural). The great body of Âryans to-day profess Turano-Semitic religions.

† It is noteworthy that, while in the Homeric poems the Turanian gods (see p. 88) play little part, they become prominent as soon as Aryanism gets the upper hand. Tragedy, comedy, and all the "mysteries" are connected with them; indeed, belong to them.

tie. In Homer, none of the gods but Zeus is married ✓ or has a household; in Hesiod, they are nearly all married and have families.* His *Theogony* is the earliest attempt in history at a reflective, systematic, teachable theology.†

If, now, it be asked why the Greeks did not, like the Iranians, succumb to military despotism and supernatural priestcraft (see p. 73), the answer is easy. The Iranians were subject to the Semites before they were their masters, and the Semites to whom they were subject had accepted, as agents of the Unseen, the Turanian priesthood. The Greeks, on the contrary, were never subject to the Semites, and the Semites whom they conquered, and whose civilization they adopted, had never submitted to the Turanian priesthood. Thus, among the Greeks, the agricultural or producing class held its own and found a mouthpiece in Hesiod. At the same time, the heroic themes and Âryanized heroes and heroines of Homer—Hector and Achilles, Penelope, Andromache and Nausicaa—secured him an abiding place in the hearts of the whole people. In this way ✓ the Greeks escaped the tyranny of the priesthood altogether, and that of the military class to a large extent. It is this fact, more than anything else, that enabled them to rise to the consciousness of free individuality and to introduce civic life into the world.

* This is an Âryan trait, with profound implications. Semitic gods have "faces" (Exod. XXXIII. 14), but are not married.

† Hesiod is the earliest Greek schoolmaster, instructor in the arts of peace. His *Theogony* and his *Works and Days*, a sort of versified Farmer's Manual, are the earliest school-books. See Heraclitus, Frag. 35 (Edit. Bywater). In the *Theogony*, Zeus, though evolved like everything else, is the supreme god, and stands for Âryan supremacy, order, and family life. At the same time he has borrowed many Semitic traits, and is said to have been born in Crete.

The education current in Homer's time is summed up in the words of Phœnix, the guardian of Achilles: "For this end he [Peleus] sent me forth to teach thee all these things: to be a speaker of words and a doer of deeds." * It was wholly practical, and acquired in the commerce of life, often, no doubt, under the guidance of some skilled tutor like Phœnix, who was, probably, a Phœnician. There were no schools in those days, because there were no books. Though letters were known to the Phœnicians and to other inhabitants of Western Asia long before the date of Homer, there is no clear proof that he was acquainted with them.† In spite of this, the Homeric world is a highly educated one, perhaps the highest type of civilization without book-learning that is known to us. So true is this that we, the people of to-day, find ourselves far more at home in it than in the less remote world of the Middle Age. Homer's Achaians,‡ and even his Trojans, though gifted with but little knowledge, are far advanced in ethical culture and refinement. Bravery, prudence, truthfulness, loyalty, kindness, hospitality, female chastity, are among the virtues admired and practised by them. Agamemnon and Odysseus, Achilles and Patroclus, Priam and Hector, Andromache and Penelope, Arêtê and Nausicaa, not to mention the less worthy Menelaus and Helen, are characters which the world refuses to forget. The Achaian family and social life is sweet and tender. Woman is free and occupies a high

* Iliad, IX., 438 seq.

† On the *σήμετα λυγρὰ* of Iliad, VI., 168, see Jebb, *Introd. to Homer*, p. 112. The oldest Greek inscriptions do not go further back than the seventh century B.C.

‡ Homer calls the inhabitants of Greece Achaians, Argeians, and Danaans, never Hellenes. See Gladstone, *Juventus Mundi*, pp. 30-72.

place. Polygamy is unknown.* Slavery exists; but the slave is a member of the family, and well treated. Though there is a trait of savagery in the Achaian character, we always feel that the men and women are gentlemen and ladies. They are all intensely human and have that most admirable of all qualities, perfect simplicity. There is no more perfect gentleman than the Phæacian Alcinous, no more perfect lady than his daughter Nausicaa. Though there is a good deal of superstition, it is never of the craven sort, while there is much genuine piety and moral reverence for the gods.† These are not separated, as among oriental nations, by any wide gulf from man. They are stronger and wiser, indeed, but they do not belong to a different race.‡ Zeus is "father of gods and men," and all are equally subject to Fate, that dark, irresistible power which sets a limit to all caprice.§ Belief in immortality exists; but, as among the pre-exilic Hebrews, it is vague and gloomy. The shade of the great Achilles declares that he "would rather be a serf and a thrall to another, to a man with no land of his own and little means, than rule over all the wasted dead." || The works of art mentioned or depicted by Homer show considerable advance, but seem to be mostly of Phœnician origin. It is

* Among the Trojans, Priam is a polygamist (Iliad, XXIII., 495-97). In spite of characters like Hector and Andromache, Trojan civilization is inferior to Achaian.

† "All men hunger after gods," says the son of Nestor (Odys., III., 48). "Jove will never be an abettor of liars," says Agamemnon (Iliad, IV., 235).

‡ See Schiller, *Die Götter Griechenlands*.

§ See Gladstone, *Juventus Mundi*, pp. 358 seq. Cf. Gilbert, *Griechische Götterlehre*, pp. 112 seq.

|| Odys., XI., 489 seq.; cf. Iliad, XXIII., 100 seq. The Hades of the Greeks is an exact counterpart of the *Sheol* of the Hebrews and is, doubtless, borrowed. Cf. *Phases of Ancient Feeling towards Death*, note E to Geddes's *Phædo of Plato*.

curious that he nowhere mentions a statue of god or man, and rarely a temple.

Gladstone has entitled a work on Homer *Juventus Mundi*, and there is a general impression that the civilization depicted by Homer is young and vigorous; but a closer study of his works shows that it was, on the contrary, verging to decline. It may be said to have come to an end about the date of the first Olympiad, 776 B.C., when Greek civilization proper began—a civilization in which the material was mainly due to Semitism, the form and the ideals to Hellenism.

The Hellenes set out on their political career with two new elements, a Hellenized Semitic alphabet, expressing vowels, as well as consonants—hence completely phonetic; and the poetry of Homer, of which the materials—the myths, legends, gods, and heroes—are Semitic, while the form and the ideals are purely Aryan.* It is difficult to overestimate the value of these elements. The use of letters necessitated the establishment of schools, and, as the priests had no recognized standing, and no special connection with learning, these fell into the hands of laymen—a new event in history, and one of infinite significance. The Homeric poems, though never endowed with canonical authority, became the property of the whole people, the great textbook in education, presenting types of individual virtue, manly and womanly, that could not fail to be fatal to despotism and conducive to liberty. The Homeric heroes and heroines became the ideals of the Greek peo-

* Cf. Tennyson's *Idyls of the King*, in which the material is due to the conquered Celts, while the form is English. The word "Homer" (*Ὅμηρος*) means hostage, and may point to a fact.

ple. Thus the harmless-seeming creations of the poet's fancy became powerful agents in shaping actual life to noble issues.

Greek education, from the first, had for its aim individual Excellence or Worth (*ἀρετή*),* often named, from its two component elements, Fair-and-good-ness (*καλοκαγαθία*), that is perfection of body in strength and beauty, and perfection of soul in wisdom, fortitude, temperance, and justice. At the same time, this ideal of individual excellence was never separated from that of public usefulness. Individual worth was worth for public ends, for social and political life.† Such education naturally fell into two parts, Gymnastics for the body, and Music for the soul. Music was never dissociated from Poetry, and hence, in later times, mental education broke up into two parts, Music proper and Letters (*γράμματα*). These might be regarded either as Arts or Sciences. As arts, they were used to purify or purge the soul; as sciences, to instruct or enlighten it. Hence education came to consist of three parts: (1) Gymnastics, (2) Purgation, (3) Instruction.

Temporally regarded, Greek or Hellenic education falls into two great periods, the "Old" and the "New," the former corresponding to the theological, the latter to the philosophical, phase of Greek thought. The "New Education" was largely due to the efforts of individual thinkers, some of whom wrote treatises on

* All this is admirably set forth in Aristotle's pæan to Worth, for a translation of which see my *Aristotle*, p. 4.

† As a rule, it was only the free citizens, the full burgesses, whose circumstances were such as to enable them to devote their whole time (except that demanded by the care of their patrimony) to public affairs, that received education. Women, artisans, and slaves were practically excluded from it.

education. After Greece fell under the power of Macedonia, and her influence spread over the great East, there arose a half-cosmopolitan form of education, which may be called Hellenistic, and which falls into two periods, a Macedonian, proceeding from Alexandria, and a Roman, proceeding from Rome.

The "Old Education" of Greece, which the Spartans never abandoned, but carried to extremes, was a discipline, intended to form citizens, god-fearing, law-abiding, patriotic, brave, and strong. The state (πόλις), of which the family, the township (δημος), and the tribe (φυλή) were component parts, absorbed the whole man and demanded his entire activity. The scope of this education is admirably stated by Aristophanes, in words put into the mouth of Right Reason: "When I was in my prime, and self-control was held in respect, . . . a child was not allowed to be heard uttering a grumble. Then all the boys of the quarter were obliged to march, in an orderly way and with the scantest of clothing, along the streets to the music-master's, and this they did, even if it snowed like barley-groats. Then they were set to rehearse a song . . . either 'Pallas, mighty city-stormer,' or 'A shout sounding far,' putting energy into the melody which their fathers handed down. And, if anyone attempted any fooling, or any of those trills, like the difficult inflexions *à la* Phrynis now in vogue, he received a good thrashing for his pains, as having insulted the Muses. Again, at the physical trainer's, the boys, while sitting, were obliged to keep their legs in front of them. . . . At dinner they were not allowed to pick out the best radish-head, or to snatch away anise or celery from their elders, or to

gourmandize on fish or field-fares, or to sit with their legs crossed. . . . Take courage, young man, and choose me, the Better Reason, and you shall know how to hate the public square, to avoid the bath-houses, to be ashamed of what is shameful, to show temper when anyone addresses you in ribald language, to rise from your seat when your elders approach, and not to be a lubber to your own parents, or to do any other unseemly thing to mar the image of Modesty, or to rush to the house of the dancing girl . . . or to talk back to your father, or, addressing him as Japhet, to revile the old age which made the nest for you. . . . Then, fresh and blooming, you will spend your time in the gymnasium, and not go about the public square, mouthing monstrous jokes, like the young men of to-day, or getting dragged into slippery, gumshon-bamboozling disputes; but, going down to the Academy, with some worthy companion of your own age, you will start a running-match, crowned with white reed, smelling of smilax, leisure, and deciduous white poplar, rejoicing in the spring, when the plane-tree whispers to the maple. If you do the things which I enjoin, and give your mind to them, you will always have a well-developed chest, a clear complexion, broad shoulders, and a short tongue.” *

Modesty, reverence, purity, hardihood, strength, self-control, sociability, and patriotism—these are the virtues which the Old Education sought to cultivate. Reading and writing were, doubtless, taught; but they were not prominent. The literary education consisted mainly in singing the productions of the old bards, Homer, Hesiod, and the earlier lyric poets. Religion accompanied everything.

* *Clouds*, vv. 962-84 ; 1002-13.

The passage from Aristophanes is, mainly, a description of school education (extending from the seventh to about the fifteenth year of the child's life), as distinguished from family education, on the one hand, and from state (or college) education, on the other. Family education was in the hands of mothers and slaves, and seems to have been humane, but rather unsystematic. Games and stories, varied with singing and discipline, filled the waking life of the child. Correct behavior and obedience were strongly insisted upon. In Sparta, state education began with the school; in Athens, only with the college. In the former, both sexes received state education; in the latter, only the boys. Athenian girls received no schooling outside the family; Spartan girls received public instruction in gymnastics and simple music, just as the boys did.

While the Spartan state was a sort of military socialism, supported by public slaves (helots), Athens aimed at cultivating the arts of peace, as well as those of war. When her young men, about the age of fifteen, left school and palæstra, which were private institutions, they entered, or might enter,* the public gymnasia, and fit themselves for all the duties of citizenship, legislative, judicial, and military. Being now free from their pedagogues, they could go where they pleased and, in gymnasium, street, agora, pnyx, theatre, etc., come in contact with public men, and make themselves acquainted with all the details of public life. Under these conditions, it did not seem necessary to

* As there was no compulsion in the matter, it was, for the most part, only the sons of rich men that did so; and since only those men were eligible for public offices who had submitted to state training, it followed that, in the days of the "Old Education," all these offices were in the hands of the wealthier classes.

provide any special intellectual training for them, whereas their gymnastic exercises were carefully continued. A scientific trainer subjected them to those severer exercises which prepared them for camp life.* At the same time they learnt to ride, drive, row, swim, banquet, etc. Their life was almost entirely spent in public and in the open air. Seeing little of family life, and almost nothing of respectable young girls, they had little opportunity of developing their affectional nature in a healthy way, and hence were exposed to grave dangers. This was the weakest side of Athenian education.

At the age of eighteen, the Athenian youth reached his majority, and became an independent citizen—we might fairly say, took the degree of citizen. His name was enrolled in the *demos* to which he belonged, he cut his long hair, and put on the dark garb of the citizen. He was presented to the assembled people, furnished with shield and spear, and made to take the Solonian oath of loyalty to the state.† He was now an *ephebos*, or citizen-novice, with a novitiate of two years of hard military service still before him. The first year he spent near Athens, drilling and acquiring a knowledge of military tactics. At the close of it, if he passed his examination, he was drafted off to the frontier, to act as militiaman in some guard-house, or as mounted policeman. At the end of the second, he underwent a “manhood examination” (*δοκιμασία εἰς ἄνδρας*), and, if successful, took his place in the ranks of full citizens, there to receive his university education, which ended only with his death. Such was the “Old

* The athletic habit was not cultivated. The exercises were running, leaping, discus-throwing, wrestling, boxing.

† See my *Aristotle*, p. 61.

Education" of Greece, the education which produced such men as Miltiades, Themistocles, Aristides, Phocion, Æschylus, Pericles, Socrates, and made possible such victories as those of Marathon, Salamis, and Plataeæ. It was emphatically an education for civic manhood, and it was gloriously successful. Its ideal was the perfect citizen.

Thus far, the man and the citizen had not been distinguished, and no place had been left for the former, as such—for individualism. But the day came for that also, a day heralded by two events, the Persian Wars and the rise of Philosophy or Reflection. The former showed the value of the free, civic individual, as against the despot-ruled mass, and led to democracy; the latter turned attention to the facts of nature and life, and away from the myths by which the meaning of these had been distorted; in a word, to science and away from theology. The former brought external, the latter internal, freedom to the individual, as such.

The absence of distinct priestly and military classes almost of necessity led to democracy, the Persian Wars merely completing a work already far advanced. The same thing made Philosophy possible; for priestly and military organization is everywhere the foe of free reflection. We have already seen that in Homer the many capricious (Semitic) gods had behind them an inexorable Fate or Necessity, due to Âryan thought. As Âryanism gained the upper hand in Greece, this concept, under the name of Nature (*φύσις*), gradually came to the front and set itself up in opposition to Convention (*νόμος, θεῖσις*), to which the gods, since they were not universal, but different among different peoples, owed their origin.

Thus arose in the Greek mind the distinction between Necessity, the basis of science and philosophy, and Convention, the basis of mythology and theology, or, in a word, between science and theology—a distinction which slowly ripened into a conflict, going on to this day.* Greek philosophy was originally an appeal from conventional and local gods to universal Necessity or Nature, an endeavor to find some stable principle of life, amid the conflict of various gods and worships. In more modern language, it was an appeal from particular subjectivity to universal objectivity. Nature was supposed to be independent of human feeling or desire. Nothing is more interesting, in the history of human thought, than the process by which this supposition came to be disproved, and the discovery made that nature is *νόμος*, conventional, or subjective. This is not the place to write, even briefly, the history of pre-Socratic philosophy. Suffice it to say that it ended with the two famous sayings of Protagoras: "About the gods, I cannot know whether they are or are not," and "Man is the measure of all things, of the existent as existent, and of the non-existent as non-existent." The former abolished the gods and theology, the latter, nature and science. All that remained was individual subjectivity, or universal convention. Thus, for the first time in the history of the world, individualism made its claim to absolute validity. No more momentous event ever took place. As presented by Protagoras, this claim undermined the entire basis upon which Greek political and ethical life and education rested, and the

* See *Æschylus, Agam.*, 4-10; *Prometh.*, 511-19; Lersch, *Sprachphilosophie der Alten*, pp. 4 seq.; White, *Hist. of the Warfare of Science and Theology*; Bussell, *The School of Plato*, pp. 29 seq.

result threatened to be complete anarchy. There seemed to be nothing stable anywhere.* If anything of the sort existed, it must evidently be sought where it had been least expected, in man himself. Here Socrates, the arch-sophist,† sought and found it, opening up a new career for philosophy. He discovered, by his dialectic (conversational) method, that, while all sensation, or feeling, as such, is subjective and individual (so far the sophists were right), the world of essences, or things, which we place behind the bundles of these, as grouping and conditioning them, that is, the world of completed thoughts, or *ideas*,‡ is objective, virtually the same in all men. By this discovery, he was able to vindicate the claim of the individual to absolute validity, and, at the same time, to reconcile that claim with political and moral life. In a word, ✓ *Socrates discovered free personality* and moral freedom, and made the greatest of all epochs in the world's history. In doing so, he likewise introduced a distinction between the subjective and objective worlds, a distinction which had momentous consequences.

In the hands of Plato, that great poetic genius, who undertook to continue the work of Socrates, this distinction hardened into a separation between the subjective and extra-subjective worlds.§ Socrates's completed

* For the result upon education see the passage from Aristophanes quoted in my *Aristotle*, pp. 60 seq.

† Sophist was not a term of reproach in his time. See Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, Vol. VIII., pp. 151 seq.; Hegel, *Gesch. der Philos.*, Vol. II., pp. 1 seq.; Bussell, *School of Plato*, pp. 61 seq. Socrates adopted the fundamental positions of the Sophists, and supplemented them. See Siebeck, *Untersuch. zur Philos. der Griechen*, pp. 1-63.

‡ It is not certain that Socrates used the term "idea," but he certainly had the notion.

§ Object, of course, has no meaning apart from subject. They are not two things, but two aspects of the same thing in consciousness. Kant and his followers have blundered sadly in this respect. See Trendelenburg, *Elementa Logices Aristoteleæ*, p. 54, note 2.

thoughts, the same *in* all consciousness, now become ideas, *outside* of all consciousness—a world of things-in-themselves, subsisting by themselves.* Thus, not only was the world doubled, but the unseen world of ideas came to be regarded as the reality, of which the seen or sensible world was only a shadow. Those who accepted this view naturally turned their interest away from the shadowy, to the real, world, and, in so doing, found a sphere for the individual. Thus there came to be a lower social life of civic duties, and a higher individual life of ideal contemplation (*θεωρία*), or self-sufficing joy (*διαγωγή*), and the latter tended ever, more and more, to increase in importance. As the state had made no provision for this sort of life, education for it fell into the hands of private individuals, philosophers, whose influence, earnest and noble though it often was, could not but tend to draw their pupils away from civic and temporal affairs, and to direct their attention upon eternal relations. The state was no longer the sole sphere of human activity. A sphere infinitely greater and more attractive had risen up in the imagination and was calling for a large share of effort. In a word, civic solidarity began to give place to celestial solidarity, until, finally, the natural and civic came to be regarded as something evil, to be escaped from as soon as possible. Thus arose the idea of purification (*κάθαρσις*) or deliverance (*ἀπαλλαγή*), which later passed into that of redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*). The body was now regarded as a prison† or a tomb,‡ and death as the transition from appearance to

* In later life, Plato turned his back upon this view; but it was too late. See Lutoslawski, *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, pp. 425 seq.

† *φρονιμά*, Plato, *Phædo*, 62 B. Cf. 64 C.; 69 C.

‡ Heraclitus even said, *Σώματα σήματα*, Bodies are barrows. Frag. LI.

reality. The foundation of mysticism and asceticism was laid: the phenomenal world and, with it, natural science, for the most part, were placed under the ban.

To the old curriculum of gymnastics, music, and letters, the "New Education" added (1) Mathematics (geometry and astronomy*), and (2) Philosophy, the former being regarded as an introduction to the latter. Of the method of teaching geometry we have an admirable specimen of Euclid; of that of teaching philosophy, in the dialogues of Plato.† Philosophy took institutional form in "Schools" (Σχολαί) ‡ which stood apart from, and over against, the State, like so many religious sects or churches—nurseries of individualism and mysticism.

Aristotle tried to heal the breach between Plato's two worlds by maintaining that ideas (εἶδη) exist only in individuals;§ but he left the root of mysticism untouched, by admitting one exception, namely, the supreme idea, or God, whom he conceived as an empty, formal "thinking of thinking," standing apart from the world, and being neither its creator nor its active guide.|| In spite of this, he contributed enormously to the revival and advance of science. He may be said to be the founder of the natural, political, ethical, logical, and æsthetic sciences. It was singularly unfortunate for the world that,

* See Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 201 seq.

† Aristotle, in his "exoteric" teaching, used the dialogic method. See Bernays, *Die Dialoge des Aristoteles, in ihrem Verhältniss zu seinen übrigen Werken*.

‡ As we shall see, later on, these schools are the parents, not only of our universities, but also of the religious orders. The earliest school-founder was Pythagoras.

§ Plato held to *universalia ante rem*, Aristotle to *universalia in re*, and the Cynics and Stoics to *universalia post rem*. (See Hauréau, *De la Philos. Scolastique*, cap. III.; Zeller, *Philos. der Griechen*, Vol. IV., p. 71, 2d Edit.) These distinctions will show their importance later.

|| *Metaph.*, XI., 7; 1072b seq.; and cf., throughout, Elser, *Die Wirkung des Aristotelischen Gottes*.

for several hundred years after his death, his influence was confined to a narrow circle of disciples, while that of Plato was widely diffused. The result was the decay of scientific research, and the growth of a fanciful world-view, which, because it was untrue, had to seek refuge in sacredness and, ultimately, when this did not suffice, in external authority. Such a view, though professing to be profoundly philosophical, was in reality merely mythological, and was, therefore, eminently fitted to combine with those hoary Oriental mythologies, with which, owing to the conquest of Alexander and the spread of Hellenism, it was soon to come in contact.

With Aristotle, Greek thought and, with it, Greek ideals and Greek education, came to an end. What is called Greek thought, subsequent to him, is mostly a compound of Hellenic (Platonic) mythologic idealism and Oriental religion, and is professed almost entirely by men of non-Hellenic blood—Jews, Phœnicians, Syrians, Arabs, etc. Its aim is no longer the discovery of truth upon which to found a natural social order, but the construction of a supernatural world in which to take refuge from the social order altogether.* The truth is, Alexander's empire, in destroying civic solidarity, made the endeavor after extra-civic or contra-civic solidarity, superhuman or subhuman culture, almost a necessity.

With the decay of Hellenic civic culture arose Hellenistic culture, whose tendencies were distinctly cosmopolitan, and which, therefore, comes under the rubric of hu-

* Almost the only exception is Epicureanism, whose founder seems to have been a pure Greek; but even it teaches man to look for satisfaction, not in civic life, but in subjective friendship. Stoicism, whose founder was plainly a Semite, in calling upon men to live "according to nature" forbade them to live according to *human* nature, which is essentially social and civic.

man culture. Before we pass on to this, and the education corresponding to it, we must cast a brief glance at Roman civic culture and education.

(3) *Roman Education*

Who would command must in command find bliss :

.

Enjoyment vulgarizes.

—GOETHE, *Faust*.

Then none were for a party,
 But all were for the state ;
 And the rich man loved the poor,
 And the poor man loved the great.
 Then lands were fairly portioned
 And spoils were fairly sold ;
 For the Romans were like brothers
 In the brave days of old.

—MACAULAY.

The Romans were distinguished from all other nations, not only by the extreme earnestness and precision with which they conceived their law and worked out the consequences of its fundamental principles, but by the good-sense which made them submit to the law, once established, as an absolute necessity of political health and strength. . . . The divine law, the elder sister of the civil law, was the pattern on which the latter was moulded.—WILHELM IHNE.

The Romans were a cold, calculating, selfish people, without enthusiasm or the power of awakening enthusiasm, distinguished by self-control and an iron will rather than by graces of character. They were proud, overbearing, cruel, and rapacious.—*Ib.*

The old Roman theology was a hard, narrow, unexpansive system of abstraction and personification which strove to represent in its pantheon the phenomena of nature, the relations of men in the state or in the clan, every act and feeling and incident in the life of the individual. But, unlike the mythologies of Hellas and the

East, it had no native principle of growth or adaptation to altered needs of society and the individual imagination. It was singularly wanting in awe and mystery. The religious spirit which it cultivated was formal, timid, and scrupulous.—DILL, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, pp. 62 seq.

When we pass from Athens to Rome, we pass from poetry to prose; from an artists'-picnic to a business house; from a people seeking to make the present beautiful, and to enjoy it rationally and nobly, to a people that subordinates present enjoyment to future gain; from a people that lives by reason to a people that lives by authority. While the Athenians "rejoice before" their gods, the Romans keep a debtor and creditor account with theirs, and are very anxious that the balance shall always be on the right side. (There is a strong resemblance between the Romans and the Spartans. There are in both the same stern organization, the same complete subordination of the individual to the state, the same contempt for enjoyment and all the gentler and fairer sides of life. But there is this striking and important difference: while the Spartans are held together by a severe and even exaggerated discipline, the Romans hold together of their own free-will, like a company of co-operative workmen. This accounts for much in Roman life—its conservativeness, prosaic practicality, exclusiveness, and permanence—as well as in Roman education. The original co-operative association, having attained success, and therewith certain advantages over its neighbors, was loath to open its doors to new-comers and equally loath to abandon the principles to which its first success was due. Hence the long struggle between patricians and plebeians.

Rome * seems to have arisen from a combination (συννοικισμός) of villages inhabited by peoples of different races—Turanians, Semites, and Âryans—who at different times had settled upon the Septimontium. The Âryans were, doubtless, the dominant factor; but the others contributed important elements: the Turanians, the bulk of the religious notions and rites; the Semites, the prosaic practicality and thirst for power. With their language the Âryans, naturally, imposed their political forms.

Roman education, like Roman life, was intensely practical, merely preparing for the functions of domestic and political (including religious) life. Roman religion was never an individual matter, touching the inner individual life; it was the combining force of family and of state. It naturally followed that, for long ages, there were no schools in Rome. The necessary education was imparted in the family, in the forum, and in the field. There were no books. Annals and laws were recorded by special functionaries, specially educated for the purpose. Ballads, warlike and religious songs, and laws were committed to memory and chanted to rude, simple airs. Even in her best days, Rome was almost entirely innocent of literature, art, and science.

In the Roman family the father was absolute master, and, though the wife occupied a responsible and honored position, she was legally a daughter (*in loco filiae*). The children might be exposed, put to death, or sold into slavery, at the will of the father.† If Greek fathers

* Originally, in all likelihood, a Semitic *Rāmā* or "high place," sacred to Baal, called Pales by the Romans, who celebrated to him the Palilia.

† On the *patria potestas* see *Institutes* of Justinian.

sought to make their sons independent as early as possible, Roman fathers did exactly the opposite. As a result of rigid discipline, Roman family life was grave, dignified, laborious, and god-fearing—one might almost say, puritanic. The children learnt, first of all, to obey their parents and to fear the gods. As soon as they could leave the nursery, the boys, instead of dividing their day as Athenian boys did, between the palæstra and the school, under careful supervision, were turned loose to romp, play ball, swim, ride, etc. About the age of sixteen, they assumed the *toga virilis*, were registered as citizens, and began to perform the duties of such—duties which they learnt by actual practice in field and forum, in the society of their elders. Meanwhile, the girls remained quietly at home with their mothers, learning the arts of domestic life. Nowhere, perhaps, is the Roman girl's ideal better expressed than in an ancient epitaph on a worthy matron:

- “ Stranger, my tale is briefly told ;
O stay, and read with care.
This gloomy tomb contains the bloom
Of one that once was fair.
- “ Her name was Claudia. To her lord
Her heart's full love she paid.
Two sons she had, one left on earth
And one beside her laid.
- “ Her words were mild, her manners chaste ;
Her home she ruled in peace.
She plied the distaff and the loom.
Now go thy way : I cease.”

The education here outlined is that of the oldest period, before Rome came much in contact with Greek culture.

This contact began as far back, at least, as the rise of the Republic, and from that time on we find a gradual infiltration of literary education.* It was not, however, till about the middle of the third century B.C. that regular schools were opened. The oldest schoolmaster known to us was Spurius Carvilius. He and his fellows, however, were at a great disadvantage for want of school-books, there being no such thing as an available Roman literature. In a short time this deficiency was supplied by the rise of a literature imitated from the Greek—the works of Nævius, Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Pacuvius, and Plautus. The Latin version of the *Odyssey*, by the second of these, now became for the Romans what the Homeric poems generally had long been for the Greeks. At the same time the knowledge of the Greek language became more and more an accomplishment of the upper classes, being imparted by slave tutors. When at last, in 146 B.C., Greece became a Roman province,

“Captive Greece took captive her rude conqueror,
And brought the arts to Latium,” †

in spite of all the efforts of the elder Cato to uphold the old Roman rigorous discipline.‡ From this point on Roman education becomes, like education everywhere, Hellenistic, and hardly calls for special treatment. For considerable time instruction was imparted in the Greek language; but about 100 B.C. a Roman *equus*, Lucius

* The Ephesian Hermodorus, uncle of Heraclitus, the philosopher, is said to have had a share in drawing up the laws of the Twelve Tables, 451 B.C.

† Horace.

‡ Cato died in 148 B.C. His book on Education (*De Liberis Educandis*) has not come down to us. Despite all his efforts, he was far from being unaffected by Greek culture.

Ælius Præconius Stilo, inspired by patriotism, opened a school in which Latin was employed, and from that time on the use of Greek declined. Among Præconius's pupils were Varro and Cicero, who, along with Julius Cæsar, may be called the fathers of Latinity.

But, although the Latin language triumphed, Roman education under the empire is, in all respects, Greek, while Roman literature is but a rather formal and stilted imitation of Greek models. The studies most in favor at Rome were Grammar (Literature), Rhetoric, and Philosophy, the last remaining always a mere elegant accomplishment. Rhetoric, by reason of its practical use, was the principal study. It forms the subject of the chief work * of the greatest of Roman educators, Quintilian, who, about A.D. 68, opened a school of rhetoric at Rome, and under Vespasian received a salary from the public treasury. This work gives us an outline of Roman education in the early centuries of our era. It tells us how the child is to be nursed, taught good habits of action and speech, instructed in reading, writing, and literature. Home education is deprecated and emulation in school is to be encouraged. The chief studies in school are Grammar—that is, Literature, consisting of Methodics and Histories—Music, and Astronomy. On leaving school, ambitious young men place themselves in the hands of the rhetorical teacher, under whom they learn all the arts, with a view to conversation and public speaking. Knowledge for knowledge's sake hardly enters into the calculations of the Roman. With him rhetoric, the power of saying, takes the place of philosophy, the power of thinking.

* *De Institutione Oratoria.*

In other respects besides this, Roman education remained un-Greek. It was essentially unæsthetic, aiming not at "sweetness and light," but rather at force and effectiveness. It was not culture, but discipline, always harsh, and not seldom brutal. Boys were licked black and blue for mispronouncing a word in reading. The school-sessions were long, extending, with but a brief recess, from early dawn to sunset. The school-rooms were often mere sheds, and nearly always poor and ill-furnished, without desks, and often without seats. As a state, Rome at no period of her existence took much interest in education: all the schools were, therefore, private enterprises, and, as the profession of teacher was despised, teaching fell into the hands of men who were fit for nothing else—generally freed-men, or even slaves. The fact that they took pay for their services brought them into the same social category as the carpenter and the shoemaker, and they were treated as these were. It was only in imperial times that rhetoricians, like Quintilian, enjoyed some consideration.

It is interesting to realize that, if Rome adopted Greek education, this was no mere matter of accident. If her rule was to be universal, as she meant it to be, her culture had to be so likewise, and Greek culture was in those days the only one that could lay claim to universality, the reason being that it rested upon reason, which is universal, and not upon tradition, which is local and national. But of this more in the next chapter.

BOOK II.

HUMAN EDUCATION

HUMAN EDUCATION

INTRODUCTORY

I am a man : I hold nothing human alien to me—MENANDER.

Nature ordains that a man should wish the good of every man, whoever he may be, for the simple reason that he is a man.—CICERO, *De Offic.*, III., 6.

We are members of one great body. Nature made us relatives when she begat us from the same materials and for the same destiny. She planted in us mutual love and fitted us for social life.—*Seneca*, *Epist.* xcv.

What is Roman knight or freedman or slave ? They are but names having their origin in ambition or wrong.—*Id.*, *Epist.* xxxi.

You are a citizen and a part of the world. . . . The duty of a citizen is in nothing to consider his own interest distinct from that of others, as hand or foot, if they possessed reason and understood the law of nature, would do and wish nothing that had not some relation to the rest of the body.—EPICTETUS.

As Antonine, my country is Rome ; as a man, the world.—MARCUS AURELIUS.*

People at the civic grade of culture draw a sharp distinction between themselves and their neighbors, with implied superiority on their own side. Each is held together by its own gods, its own laws and customs, its own language, literature, and memories, and looks down upon all the others. The Jew places him-

* See Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*, Vol. I., pp. 253 seq.

self above the gentile; the Greek himself above the barbarian, and so on. Even when peoples of different races and tongues are united under a common government, there is always one ruling race which holds the others in subjection and contempt. There is as yet no feeling or recognition of a common, all-embracing humanity. Nor, indeed, can there be until the distinctively human element in humanity is brought into prominence. This element is Reason, in which all men share. So long as men live by tradition, by laws supposed to have been divinely given to particular men, or by mere use and wont, so long they have no common bond; so long they stand opposed to each other in nations and groups. In proportion as Reason rules, they unite, and the result is human culture, in the attempt to realize which the world has been engaged for over two thousand years, so far, it is sad to think, with but very partial success. The reasons for this we shall try to make clear.

DIVISION I.

SUPERNATURAL BEGINNINGS OF HUMANISM

CHAPTER I.

HELLENISTIC EDUCATION

It had been the fond dream of Alexander to found a universal empire, which should be held together not merely by the unity of the government, but also by the unity of language, customs, and civilization. All the Oriental races were to be saturated with Hellenic culture, and to be bound together into one great whole by means of this intellectual force. . . . All Western Asia, in fact, if not among the wide masses of the population, yet certainly among the higher ranks of society, became thoroughly Hellenized. Even in Palestine about the beginning of the second century this movement was in full progress.—SCHÜRER, *Hist. of the Jews in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. I., Vol. I., pp. 194 seq.

It was the crowning glory of the Greek people and, in the last resort, of Socrates,* to have discovered reason, and thus to have made possible human culture, education, and moral freedom. As soon as the knowledge of this discovery spread, Greece ceased to be able

* The Reason (λόγος) of Heraclitus and the Intellect (νοῦς) of Anaxagoras are nature-ordering principles, rather than sources of authority in man. Indeed, reason, in the Socratic sense, could not have been discovered, until the sophists had done their work of showing "nature" to be subjective.

to live as a small polity, and claimed universal sway. In less than a century her sons had carried Greek education and culture over the whole East. We have already seen that nearly all "Greek" philosophers after Aristotle were Orientals. We have now to add that they were no longer, strictly speaking, philosophers at all. The truth is, when the Greeks became dominant in the East, bringing with them their schools, gymnasia, theatres, stadia, and the results of these, they so fascinated the subject peoples that these endeavored to approximate their conquerors by trying to translate their national creeds and mythologies into the universal thought-forms of the latter. Thus there arose those numerous compounds of Eastern mythology and Greek thought which we know as Hellenistic philosophy—Neo-Pythagoreanism, Neo-Mazdeism,* Gnosticism, Philonism,† etc. This amalgamation was rendered comparatively easy by the semi-mythical form into which Plato, Aristotle, and Zeno had converted the Socratic doctrine. The "ideas" (ἰδέαι) of Plato, the "forms" (εἶδη) of Aristotle, and the "reason" (λόγος) of the Stoics are as purely myths as Zeus, Apollo, and Athena. They have, however, the advantage of not being local or national. The Hellenization of Oriental mythology consisted mainly in translating the popular gods into the ideas of Plato and the Reason of the Stoics. The thoughts of Aristotle and Epicurus played but a small part in the process.

Though Hellenistic culture spread over the whole

* See Darmesteter, Introduction to Avesta (Sacred Books of the East), pp. iv., sqq., 2d Edit.

† Even the pious, Torah-bound Jews could not resist the advances of Hellenism; hence the Maccabæan Wars (see Schürer, *History of the Jews in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. I., Vol. I., pp. 194 seq.), and the philosophy of *Kohēleth*.

East, reaching perhaps even India, its chief centre was Alexandria, the city founded by, and named after, the great Macedonian conqueror, the city in which all the peoples of the East mixed and exchanged views, the city in which the notion of universal human brotherhood seems first to have taken root. Here—and this is the most important fact for our present purpose—Greeks and Jews lived on almost equal terms and learned to respect each other.* Here flourished the school and the palæstra of the former and the *beth-hammidrash* of the latter. Here the Greeks became acquainted with the monotheism and moral earnestness of the Jews, while the Jews learned to appreciate the culture of the Greeks. Many Greeks and half-Greeks became proselytes to Judaism,† while some Jews quietly went over to Hellenism. The Hebrew Scriptures were translated into Greek (the Septuagint), and to a large extent replaced the original. The Jews spoke Greek and called themselves by Greek names. Philo and other learned Jews translated the “Law” into the language of Plato and the Stoics, or, rather, professed to find the whole of Platonism and Stoicism in the Law, maintaining that Plato had borrowed from Moses. In order to do this they had to make use of the most shameless allegorisms, capable of making anything mean anything.‡ Thus there was a thorough commingling of Judaism and Hellenism in the thought of Alexandria. In the Jewish

* The Jews occupied two of the five quarters of Alexandria, were governed by their own laws and their own “alabarch.” See Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, Vol. I., pp. 3 seq.

† See Schürer, *Hist. of the Jews*, Div. II., Vol. II., pp. 291 seq.

‡ See the Works of Philo, and cf. Drummond, *Philo Judæus, or Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy, passim*; Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 134-51.

schools, the Greek curriculum, which at that time comprised very nearly the "Seven Liberal Arts,"* was added to the old instruction in the Torah; nay, the Torah must often have been expounded in the abstract language of Plato.†

* See the appendix to my *Aristotle, or the Ancient Educational Ideals*.

† It is hardly probable that the Greek schools below the University (Museum) borrowed anything from the Jews. If they had, the fact would be nothing to our purpose. Bigg, *ut sup.*, p. 41.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHRISTIAN "CATECHETICAL SCHOOL" OF ALEXANDRIA

Of incalculable importance was the Catechetical School of Alexandria, in the transformation of the pagan empire into a Christian one, of Greek, into ecclesiastical, philosophy. In the third century, this school scientifically rose above paganism, at the same time preserving everything that was of any value in Greek science and culture. These Alexandrians wrote for the cultured of all the world: they introduced Christianity into the culture of the world.—HARNACK, *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. I., p. 547.

In the Catechetical School of Alexandria the whole of Greek science was taught and made subservient to the ends of Christian apologetics.—*Id. ibid.*, p. 551.

As an idealistic philosopher Origen turned the whole contest of the church's faith into ideas.—*Id. ibid.*, p. 563.

In Egypt, on the very ground which in the fourth and fifth centuries was to be the home of Christian monks, there was, long before them, the ascetic life of the cloister devoted to the worship of Serapis. The ritual has many traces of our modern ideas of devotion, and foreshadows in some respects that of the Catholic Church.—DILL, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 66.

The religion of the Jews revolved round three concepts: (1) a One, .omnipotent, creative God; (2) a Messiah;* (3) Holiness,† concepts which in Christianity

* On the various meanings of this word see Bishop Westcott, *Introduc. to the Study of the Gospels*, pp. 110-73.

† On this term see Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 140 seq., 450 seq.

hardened into the three persons of the Holy Trinity. In this religion the early Christians, consisting, as they did, of Jews or proselytes, formed a sect, differing from the others mainly in the one fact that they believed the Messiah to have appeared, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and to be about to appear again. It was this Jewish Christianity, and not the gentile Christianity of Paul, that was first carried—it is said, by Mark the friend of Peter—to Alexandria. In course of time, the new sect was numerous and strong enough to open a synagogue or church* of its own, and, connected therewith, a school. The founder of this school is said to have been Athenagoras, the apologete; but it attained importance first under Pantænus† about the middle of the second century A.D. Pantænus was succeeded, first by Clement (died about 213), and then by the great Origen (died 254).

As this school became, in large measure, the type of all Christian schools for a long period, and as it forms the bridge between the ancient and mediæval educational worlds, it deserves careful consideration. Perhaps I cannot do better than quote a passage from Dr. Bigg's *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*:

—A large and rich [Christian] community, existing in the bosom of a great university town, could not long submit to exclusion from the paramount interests of the place. Their most promising young men attended the lectures of the heathen professors. Some, like Ammonius,‡ relapsed into Hellenism, some drifted into

* In early times these terms were not distinguished. See Schürer, *Hist. of the Jews*, Div. II., Vol. II., p. 58, note 48.

† A convert from Stoicism, and a man of much learning.

‡ The founder of Neo-Platonism, and the teacher of both Origen and Plotinus. He was surnamed Saccàs.

Gnosticism like Ambrosius, some like Heracles passed safely through the ordeal, and, as Christian priests, still wore the pallium or philosopher's cloak, the doctor's gown, we may call it, of the pagan academy. Learned professors like Celsus, like Porphyry, began to study the Christian Scriptures with a cool interest in this latest development of religious thought, and pointed out with the acumen of trained critics the scientific difficulties of the Older Testament and the contradictions of the New. It was necessary to recognize, and if possible to profit by, the growing connection between the Church and the lecture-room. Hence the catechetical instruction, which in most other communities continued to be given in an unsystematic way by bishop or priest, had in Alexandria developed about the middle of the century into a regular institution.

"This was the famous Catechetical School. It still continued to provide instruction for those desirous of admission into the Church, but with this humble routine it combined a higher and more ambitious function.* It was partly a propaganda, partly we may regard it as a denominational college by the side of a secular university. There were no buildings appropriated to the purpose. The master received the pupils in his own house, and Origen was often engaged till late at night in teaching his classes or giving private advice or instruction to those who needed it. The students were of both sexes, of very different ages. Some were converts preparing for baptism, some idolaters seeking for light, some Christians reading, as we should say, for

* "Schools of a similar description existed at Antioch, Athens, Edessa Nisibis; Guerike, *De Schola Alex.*, p. 2; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* 501 seq." [Vol. I., pp. 547 seq., 2d Edit.]

orders or for the cultivation of their understandings. There was as yet no rigid system, no definite classification of Catechumens, such as that which grew up a century later. The teacher was left free to deal with his task as the circumstances of his pupils or his own genius led him. But the general course of instruction pursued in the Alexandrian school we are fortunately able to discover with great accuracy and fulness of detail. Those who were not capable of anything more were taught the facts of the Creed, with such comment and explanation as seemed desirable. Others, Origen tells us, were taught dialectically. The meaning of this phrase is interpreted for us by Gregory Thaumaturgus, one of the most illustrious and attached of Origen's disciples. At the outset the student's power of reasoning and exact observation were strengthened by a thorough course of scientific study, embracing geometry, physiology,* and astronomy. After science came philosophy. The writings of all the theological poets, and of all the philosophers except the 'godless Epicureans' were read and expounded. The object of the teacher was no doubt in part controversial. He endeavored to prove the need of revelation by dwelling on the contradictions and imperfections of all human systems, or he pointed out how the partial light vouchsafed to Plato and Aristotle was but an earnest of the dayspring from on high. But the attitude of Clement or Origen toward Greek thought was not controversial in any petty or ignoble sense. They looked up to the great master-minds of the Hellenic schools with a generous admiration, and infused the same spirit into their disciples.

* That is, of course, Physics, or Natural Philosophy.

"Philosophy culminated in ethics, and at this point began the dialectic training properly so called. The student was called upon for a definition of one of those words that lie at the root of all morality, Good or Evil, Justice or Law, and his definition became the theme of a close discussion conducted in the form of question and answer. In the course of these eager systematic conversations every prejudice was dragged to light, every confusion unravelled, every error convicted, the shame of ignorance was intensified, the love of truth kindled into a passion. So far the course pursued did not differ essentially from that familiar to the heathen schools. But at this point the characteristic features of the Christian seminary come into view. We find them in the consistency and power with which virtue was represented as a subject not merely for speculation, but for practice—in the sympathy and magnetic personal attraction of the teacher—but above all in the theology, to which all other subjects of thought were treated as ancillary" (pp. 41-43).

It is to the last clauses of this quotation that we must pay special attention. What distinguished the Christian from the pagan schools was the fact that in the former all education revolved round Theology and Religion, as the means to eternal salvation. The Greeks educated for this life; the Christians for the life to come. In Christian education the national theology of the Jews held the chief place, but was rationalized, and thereby universalized, by means of Greek science. Orientalism triumphed over Hellenism: Reason became the handmaid of Faith. This fact cannot be too strongly insisted upon, because it furnishes the key to the educa-

tion of the entire Middle Age, in which the supernatural plays the chief part, and science and nature become thralls.*

But though Orientalism triumphed over Hellenism in the Christian schools of the Greek world, Hellenism and science were by no means despised. Great men, like Clement and Origen, the founders of philosophic Christian theology, held them in high esteem. Nay, the latter even maintained that the true, the spiritual Christianity was that which was grasped in the abstract forms of Greek thought (*γνώσις*), the historical Christianity of the New Testament, and Christ himself, being merely a concession to the natural man, for whom the divine had to be revealed in the flesh (*πίστις*). He thus came perilously near dropping the historical element in Christianity altogether,† as did his teacher, Ammonius, and fellow-pupil, Plotinus, the founders of Neo-Platonism.‡ Indeed, it is not unlikely that, but for the influence of Western or Roman Christianity, the Christianity of the Greek world might have been a sort of Neo-Platonism, in which Hellenism would have held the first place. But of this more in the next chapter.

* On the entire relation of Christianity to Hellenism see Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (Hibbert Lectures for 1888).

† His twofold Christianity was condemned by the Church. See Bigg, *Christian Platonists*, pp. 276 seq.; Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, pp. 57-62.

‡ Neo-Platonism, like Manichæism and Mazdeism, is a form of Messianism or Redemption. See Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, Vol. I., pp. 719-37. On Manichæism see *ibid.*, pp. 737-51.

CHAPTER III.

PATRISTIC EDUCATION

Nature and intellect—they are not named to Christians.
For doing so we burn atheists,
Because such speeches are most dangerous.
Nature is sin, intellect is devil.
Between them they foster doubt,
Their misshapen mongrel offspring.

—GOETHE, *Faust*, Pt. II., Act I.

The conversion of Constantine meant nothing less than the defeat of the State and the victory of the Church, the defeat of the mundane culture of the classical period and the victory of the super-sensual culture of the coming time. The Christianization of the State involved its overthrow. The world-denying religiosity of Christianity had absorbed the world-ruling thought of the Roman Empire.—VON EICKEN, *Mittelalt. Weltansch.*, p. 119.

The Oriental cults satisfied emotional cravings, which found no stimulus for devotion in the arid abstractions of the old Latin creed or in the brilliant anthropomorphism of Greece. They aroused and cultivated, often to a dangerous degree, intense and ecstatic feeling. In their mysteries, if they did not teach a higher morality, they raised the worshipper above the level of old conventional conformity and satisfied in some way the longing for communion with the deity and assurance of a life beyond the grave.—DILL, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, pp. 63 seq.

A group of ideas—God, Messiah, Holiness—which had originally grown up among the oppressed and exiled Jews with reference to restoration to their native land and to political power, had among the Christians

been transformed into a theory of fallen man's restoration to God in a kingdom beyond the clouds,* and this theory had found philosophical expression through contact with Greek thought. Thus arose the dogmatic theology of the Church Fathers, in which the dogmas received their material and authority from Judaism, their universal form and metaphysical import from Hellenism.† In lands where Greek language and thought prevailed, the Hellenic, philosophical element continually threatened to swamp the Jewish and give rise to a purely rational religion (Gnosticism); but elsewhere, and especially in Latin-speaking lands, the case was different. After the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), the centre of Judaic‡ or non-Hellenic Christianity was Rome. In the powerful Roman community, and in the numerous communities dependent upon it, the Jewish, traditional, non-philosophic element steadily kept the upper hand, and did its best to repel the Hellenic element. This is clearly shown by the "Apostles' Creed"—originally the baptismal formula of the Roman community—which does not contain a vestige of Greek thought or of metaphysical theory. But even when, in the interests of a catholic or universal faith, it accepted the Nicene Creed, full of Greek thought and subtlety, it did not for long allow that thought to master it, but remained true to Orientalism and revelation.§ In pro-

* A Messiah who said "My Kingdom is not of this world" could not, of course, be accepted by orthodox Jews, who expected a kingdom of this world.

† Rome supplied the organism and diffusive power.

‡ Ebionitism or purely Jewish Christianity is not here meant. It had retired to Petra, in the desert, before A.D. 70.

§ This is clearly shown by the fact that it succeeded in upholding the doctrine of the resurrection of the "flesh," a doctrine entirely repugnant to the Greeks and their followers.

portion as the Roman community's influence widened and deepened, and the Roman bishop assumed authority, in the same degree the Jewish traditional element gained ascendancy, and Greek Gnosticism was extruded; in a word, faith took the place of science; the supernatural of the natural. Under such circumstances science and learning, of course, languished, and at last virtually died out, leaving the field to faith, which, when dissociated from science, always degenerates into gross superstition. The Latin fathers, unlike the Greek, almost from the first manifested dislike and opposition to Pagan learning. Tertullian (A.D. 160-240?) would suppress it altogether as dishonoring to God; Augustine (354-430), once a good scholar, was ready, after his conversion, to turn his back upon pagan learning, declaring that "it is the uneducated who carry the Kingdom of heaven." Jerome (340-420), though sometimes recommending the study of pagan poets, even for women, on one occasion speaks of their work as mere food of demons, and his scheme of female education is suitable only for nuns of the strictest order, such as he superintended in the convents of Bethlehem. This attitude of the Latin fathers is easily comprehended, when we remember (1) that pagan learning was inextricably bound up with the pagan ideal of mundane, civic life, so utterly at variance with the supermundane, spiritual life which the Church sought to cultivate; (2) that, in their time, that learning, always merely formal, and as devoid of scientific content as incapable of imparting intellectual and moral stimulus, had sunk down into a dull, sapless routine, turning out chattering, versifying pedants, without moral earnestness, love of

truth, or literary taste. Pagan learning had died of inanity before Christian supernaturalism dug its grave.* The Rule of St. Benedict, a man of noble Roman descent (480-543?), is already written in barbarous Latin, and his biographer, Gregory the Great (died 604), severely reproved a bishop for giving instruction in Grammar (Literature), declaring that the divine word was independent of its rules. "My brother," he says, "I have learnt what I cannot think of without pain and shame, that you have thought proper to teach Grammar to certain persons. Learn then how sad and awful a thing it is that a bishop should deal with things, of which even a layman ought to be ignorant."

But, with all its contempt for the learning of vanquished paganism, Christianity could not well exist without some sort of intellectual culture, however slight. Hence, from time to time, efforts were made to keep alive the traditions of education, especially by converts who, in their youth, had attended the old grammar and rhetorical schools. Martianus Capella, an African rhetorician, probably contemporary with Augustine, wrote a sort of Encyclopædia of Education, a fantastic work, entitled *The Nuptials of Mercury and Philology*. This for hundreds of years was the textbook of the Seven Liberal Arts, which appear here for the first time. The popularity of this miserable compend throws a lurid light on the condition of learning

*Apollinaris Sidonius (431-484?), the princely Bishop of Auvergne, who, like others of his class, was very proud of his pagan learning, and inclined to make high literary pretensions, notes the decay of learning in his time, declaring that "young people no longer study, teachers are without pupils, learning pines and dies." See Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 167, and the whole of Bk. V.

in the centuries after the fifth. Boëtius (470--524?), "the last of the Romans," did his best, by means of translations from the Greek and other works, to recommend serious study to his countrymen.* St. Benedict, in his Rule, laid upon his monks the duty of reading during some part of every day, and Cassiodorus (480--575), the favorite of Theodoric, spent the last thirty years of his life mostly in the preparation of educational manuals, many of which still exist. Isidore of Seville, who died about 636, did much the same thing. Of his many extant works the most important is his *Originum sive Etymologiarum Libri XX.*, a compendious Encyclopædia of all the learning of his day. Finally, in Britain, the Venerable Bede (673--735) did his best to rescue for his countrymen what learning still remained in the world, in the hope of better days to come.†

But, in spite of all these efforts, the thick cloud of superstition and ignorance sank, heavier and heavier, over what had once been the Roman Empire, and what was now the domain of the Roman Catholic Church. The deepest darkness was reached in the eighth century, when learning had almost entirely vanished from continental Europe, and had taken what seemed a last

* There is now hardly any doubt that Boëtius, despite his pagan *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, was a Christian. See Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. III., p. 30, note 3.

† At the abbey of Wearmouth, Bede "enjoyed advantages which could not perhaps have been found anywhere else in Europe at the time; perfect access to all the existing sources of learning in the West. Nowhere else could he acquire at once the Irish, the Roman, the Gallican, and the Canterbury learning; the accumulated stores of books which Benedict [Biscop] had bought at Rome and at Vienne; or the disciplinary instruction drawn from the monasteries on the Continent, as well as from the Irish missionaries."—Bishop Stubbs, article *Bede*, in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, quoted in West's *Alcuin*, pp. 29 seq.

refuge in the Far West, in the British Isles, especially Ireland, and in the Far East, in Syria, where the Catholic Church had little or no influence. From these remote regions it returned in due time, by different routes and through different media, to its old seats. A movement started by Irish and English monks in the last years of the eighth century was met, three or four centuries later, by a movement originating in the schools of Syria and introduced into Europe by the apostles of victorious Islâm. Before we speak of these, and the results of them, it will be well to consider Muslim Education.

First of all, however, a word of warning. Those who are disposed to blame the Church severely for allowing education to lapse, and superstition to run riot, should remember two things: (1) that the inroads of the Northern barbarians were to blame for much that is laid at the Church's door; (2) that the old education was hopelessly bound up with a narrow, bigoted Roman nationalism, which it was one of the main objects of the Church to break down in favor of a universal humanism. We may declaim against the "Dark Ages" as much as we like—and there is some reason for such declamation—but we should not forget that it was under cover of their darkness that the idea of a universal human brotherhood, conceived in ancient times, was born into the world of reality. It is true that the citizenship of this brotherhood was supposed, at first, to be in heaven with its father, and this had a sad effect upon earthly affairs; but in due time, with the revival of learning and the rehabilitation of reason, it descended to the earth, and the modern world is the result.

CHAPTER IV.

MUSLIM EDUCATION

Read, in the name of thy Lord who created—Created man of concretion blood.—Read, by thy Lord most gracious, who taught the use of the pen—Taught man what he knoweth not.—*Qorân*, XCVI., 1 seq. (Muhammad's earliest revelation).

The different Arab tribes had different religions. . . . There were some among them who spoke of the resurrection, and believed that the man whose camel was killed over his grave would rise up riding, while the man whose camel was not so killed would rise up walking. And as to the learning of the Arabs, which they used to boast about, it was confined to a knowledge of their language, a regulation of their speech, composition of poems, and compiling of speeches; and, along with this, a knowledge of the times and places of the rising and setting of the constellations, and an acquaintance with the libration of the stars, and with their sending of rain, as far as such could be attained by an extraordinary degree of care and length of experience. Such knowledge was sought on account of its practical bearing on the affairs of life, and not from any scientific interest. As to knowledge of philosophy, God did not endow them with any of it, or make their nature suitable for taking any trouble about it. This was their condition under paganism.—ABU 'L FEDA.

For the last time in Arab history, Al Ghazzâlî, to a certain degree, avails himself of the right of free speculation, in order, in desperation, to betray it into the hands of faith. . . . Like a despairing sceptic, he leaps, with suicidal intent, into the All-God, in order to kill all artificial reflection.—GOSCHE, *Ghazzâlî's Leben u. Werke*, pp. 242 seq.

By the year 600 A.D., the triumph of the Oriental element in Christianity had well-nigh banished learning

and education from the domains of the Roman Church, giving place to a gloomy, unquestioning faith which sank ever deeper and deeper in the mire of superstition. What enlightenment survived had found a home beyond the limits of the Roman Empire—in Ireland, in the extreme West; in Syria, in the Far East. Of Irish learning we shall speak later on.

Syria, with its cities of Antioch, Edessa, Harran, Nisibis, etc., had, like the rest of the East, been subjected to the influence of Greek culture and learning soon after the time of Alexander. For Greek philosophy, particularly Platonism, the cultivated Syrians had shown a decided taste, combining it with their own mythology into a mongrel and fantastic creed, which later on became the parent of Christian mysticism.* In Christian times, when the narrow fanaticism of the imperial church more and more discountenanced learning and free thought, Greek scholars and thinkers fled beyond its jurisdiction into Syria, where learning still had a foothold in the schools of Edessa and Nisibis,† and added to the distinction of these. Especially was this the case in the fifth and sixth centuries. When the theology of Nestorius and the Antiochene (Syrian) school was condemned by the Church (431 A.D.), many of its adherents fled to Nisibis, and, under the leadership of Barsumas,

* On the Platonized paganism of the Harranians, see Chwolsohn's *Die Ssabier*, Vol. I., pp. 301-541. Very many of the post-Aristotelean "Greek" philosophers were Syrians, especially after the Christian era.

† "The intellectual centre of the East Syrian - Persian Church, the school of Edessa, with its offshoots in Nisibis, stands in close relations with Antioch. But in this region there now begins a most lively literary activity in the Syrian language. To the partly older translations of the Bible are added numerous translations of Greek ecclesiastical treatises, as well as original productions. The founder of this Syrian literature is the Mesopotamian Ephraem, who died in 379."—Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I., p. 196.

rent the Syrian Church away from Catholicism, and gave the school of that city a fresh importance. "In the school of Nisibis the Church possessed an institution which for centuries secured her a system of higher education, and, therewith, an important social and political position. To the older literature, consisting of translations, there was added, from the middle of the fifth century onward, a large number of philosophic, scientific, and medical treatises belonging to Greek antiquity, especially the works of Aristotle.* Through these Greek wisdom and learning, clothed in Syrian attire, found a home on these borders of Christendom." †

Thus it was that, in the centuries from the fifth to the ninth, the chief seats of learning were in the cities of Syria. But before it could be restored to the old culture-lands of Europe, there was required a new social and religious movement, capable of rousing the Catholic Church from its "dogmatic slumbers." Such a movement was Islâm.

Muhammad (570--632 A.D.), the originator of this, had, as a young man, travelled through Arabia and Syria, and there had come in contact with Jews, Ebionite and Nestorian Christians, and Sabians (Baptists), all of them "peoples of the book," that is, peoples possessing, and bowing before, certain written records, which they believed to be authoritative revelations from a supreme Lord. Having become intensely convinced that what his own bookless, lordless, ever-warring people needed, in order to hold them together, and give them strength, was

* The Nestorians, and, indeed, the Antiochene Theological School, were deeply imbued with Aristotelianism. The Nestorian "heresy" was largely due to it.

† Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I., pp. 278 seq.

a book and a lord, he set to work, with more or less conscious intent, to supply both. With his ardent, somewhat hysteric, nature, he easily came to believe that revelations from the "Lord of the Worlds" had been vouchsafed to him.* The result was the Qorân, a strange, chaotic, tiresome book, composed of Jewish, Christian, Sabian, and Arab elements, with a distinct preponderance of the first. It was not reduced to its present form till some time after his death.†

Muhammad's enterprise was an unparalleled success. His rigid, fatalistic monotheism, inculcated with the earnestness of a self-confident prophet, and not seldom at the point of the sword, was just what the Arabs needed. Between the date of the *Hijrah* (622) and that of his death (632), the whole of Arabia was converted to Islâm, and prepared to march under one banner to the conquest of the world.

So long as Islâm was confined to unreflecting, unphilosophic Arabs, that is, so long as it remained a mere faith, it needed no support from learning, and called for no special education. The "signs" (verses) of the Qorân could be communicated by word of mouth, and committed to memory; and all truth not contained in these was vain. Letters were not necessary, and, indeed, it is almost certain that Muhammad himself could neither read nor write. When, however, Islâm was carried by the sword beyond the bounds of Arabia, into the lands of ancient culture, Syria (635), Babylonia (637), Assyria (640), Egypt (642), etc., the case was different.

* The earliest of these, dating from A.D. 611, is placed at the head of this chapter. It clearly shows his chief intent.

† See Nöldeke, *Geschichte des Qorâns*, throughout.

Before it could hope for acceptance from the inhabitants of these, most of whom were Christians, it had, like Christianity, to clothe itself in the universal forms of Greek thought, and recommend itself to reason. This was done to some extent in Damascus, but afterwards, to a far greater extent, in the cities of Iraq—Bagdad, Basra, Kufa, etc. Here the works of the Greek philosophers,* physicians, and mathematicians were translated into Arabic,† partly through the medium of Syriac,‡ partly, perhaps, directly from the Greek. Schools, rivalling, and even surpassing, those of Syria, were established, and great physicians, mathematicians, and philosophers began to appear. Famous among them were Al Kindi (about 800–870), Al Farâbî (a Turk, 880–950 ±), Ibn Sina (Avicenna, 980–1037). Thus, from about the middle of the ninth century to the beginning of the twelfth, the great centres of learning in the world were the Muslim schools of Iraq. The effort on the part of the leaders of these schools to rationalize the doctrines of Islâm, had a strong tendency to undermine its supernatural authority, and to substitute for it a sort of gnostic mysticism, such as had long been current among the Syrian Christians.§ This naturally aroused the suspicion and opposition of the fanatical Arabs, who finally succeeded in putting an end to the movement, and compelling learning and reason to migrate to the Far West, to the Muslim

* Especially those of the Syrian favorite, Aristotle, who thus became for the Arabs, "the philosopher," simply.

† See Steinschneider, *Die arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*, Leipzig, 1897.

‡ See Steinschneider, *ut supra*, p. 6. The chief translators seem to have been Nestorian Christians and Harranian pagans.

§ Mysticism is at home in Syria. See Frothingham, *Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian Mystic, and the Book of Hierotheos*. Leyden, 1886.

cities of Spain. But ere this took place, the scholars of Iraq had drawn up a scheme of education which, for completeness and thoroughness, looks in vain for an equal. It was due to a small number of earnest, high-minded men, forming a society called the "Brothers of Sincerity" (*Ikhwân us Safa'*), whose aims were, in the interest of truth and righteousness, to combat the fatalism and fanaticism of Islâm, to impart as complete an education as the science of the time rendered possible, and, on the basis of this, to initiate a perfect, "sincere," social order of the Pythagorean type. In other words, they undertook to render the harsh, crude superstition of the Qorân innocuous by transmuting it, through absorption, into the Neo-Platonic Aristotelianism then popular in the East. This system drew its doctrines partly from the genuine works of Aristotle, and partly from certain spurious treatises bearing his name, but really due to the Neo-Platonists, and containing doctrines widely different from his—in fact, a whole system of evolutionary agathism, governed by spiritual laws. Chief among these treatises was the so-called "Theology of Aristotle,"* an abstract of the last three "Enneads" of Plotinus, made, apparently, by Porphyry, in Syriac, for his Syrian countrymen toward the end of the third century A.D., and translated into Arabic first of all philosophic works. Its contents largely determined the whole subsequent course of Arabic, and later, of Jewish and Christian thought.†

This system is laid down in an Encyclopædia, which must have been written about the year 1000 A.D., and

* Translated into German by Dieterici, Leipzig, 1883.

† Much of this and the following paragraphs is an abbreviation of my article "The Brothers of Sincerity," in the *International Journal of Ethics*, July, 1898.

which was printed in Calcutta, for the first time in 1812, and again in 1842, in four large volumes.* The work is divided into fifty-one tracts, which again are arranged under four heads:

- (I) Propædæutic and Logic, 13 treatises;
- (II) Natural Sciences, 17 treatises;
- (III) The Rational World-Soul, 10 treatises;
- (IV) Revealed Law, 11 treatises.

In this arrangement we have an ascent from the formal and abstract to the real and concrete. The introduction of revelation distinguishes it from all Greek classifications. To pass to details:

(I) *Propædæutic and Logic*

No. 1 deals with number, its essence and multiplicity, showing that the form of number in the soul corresponds to form in material things, and that the doctrine of number is the spring of all science and wisdom (Pythagoreanism).—No. 2 treats of Geometry, and aims at enabling the soul to grasp pure forms, apart from matter (Platonism).—No. 3 deals with Astronomy, and shows the composition of the stellar world. Its purpose is to rouse the soul to a longing for its proper home among the spheres. Here we have the very ancient theory which identifies spiritual elevation with distance from the centre of the earth, itself regarded as the centre of the universe, a theory which pervades the entire Middle Age, and finds classical expression in the *Comedy* of Dante.—No. 4

* It has, for the most part, been translated into German by Professor Dieterici of Berlin, and published in a number of separate volumes. See the preface to his *Die Philosophie der Araber im X. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Leipzig, 1876, 1879.

treats of Geography, showing that the earth is a sphere, and giving reasons why the soul descended from its true home into this world (cf. No. 50).—No. 5 deals with Music, showing that the measures of music are so many medicines for the soul, just as the different drugs are for the body, and that the revolving spheres, by rubbing against each other, produce tones and melodies. It aims to inspire the soul to ascend through the melodious spheres, to meet the spirits of prophets, martyrs, and mystic seers.—No. 6 relates to Geometric Number or Quantity, that is, to the theory of Symmetry and Æsthetics (Fine Arts).—No. 7 treats of the different Liberal Arts or Sciences, and guides the soul to a unitary conception of the world (Encyclopædia of the Sciences).—No. 8 deals with the Practical Arts. In doing so, it reveals to the soul its own substance, as author of the arts, and its relation to the body and its members, which are merely instruments of the creative soul (Encyclopædia of the Arts).—No. 9 examines Temperaments and Character, with a view to enable the soul to attain the proper mood and develop a perfect character (Ethics).—These nine tracts present a bird's-eye view of the field or matter of Science. The next four deal with Logic, or the form of science.—No. 10 deals with Porphyry's Introduction (*Εἰσαγωγή*) on the five "words"—Genus, Species, Difference, Property, and Accident.—No. 11 discusses Aristotle's ten Categories.—No. 12 his *De Interpretatione* (the Proposition).—No. 13 his Analytics (Syllogism and Method of Scientific Proof). Its purpose is to make the soul aware of its own forms and faculties.

(II) *The Natural Sciences*

No. 14 (1) treats of Matter, Form, Space, Time, and Motion, and is based on Aristotle's *Physics*.—No. 15 (2) is devoted to the General Form of the Physical World. Here, as in I. 3, we have the mediæval theory of the universe, according to which the "Throne of God" is in the outermost sphere.* It shows that all action in the universe is due to the universal soul, acting in obedience to God.—No. 16 (3) treats of Genesis and Decay, that is, of the four elements, and their transmutation into each other under the influence of the stars and revolving spheres (Mediæval substitute for Chemistry).—No. 17 (4) deals with Meteorology, and is based on Aristotle's *Meteorologica*.—No. 18 (5) is devoted to Mineralogy, enumerating the different minerals and trying to account for their origin. Its purpose is to show that the first product of the universal soul is the sublunary world, and that in this the partial souls (all individual souls are parts of the universal soul) begin their career. Starting in minerals at the earth's centre, they advance, through plants and animals, up to man, and thence rise, through the superlunary spheres, as angels, up to union with God. Here we have the Arab doctrine of evolution, which hardly differs from the Darwinian, except in not recognizing the "struggle for existence" as an agent in the process.† Instead of this, the older theory puts the natural desire of all beings to return to their source. In this tract and in the following, the "Theology of Aristotle"

* See Qorân, II., 256.

† See Dieterici, *Der Darwinismus im zehnten und neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Leipzig, 1878.

is largely drawn upon (Evolutionism).—No. 19 (6) deals with the Essence of Nature, and the manner in which it acts upon the four elements, producing the three kingdoms of nature. Its purpose is to show the action of the universal soul, and its relation to the spherul intelligences.—No. 20 (7) is devoted to Botany, showing how the various plants are pervaded by the plant-soul, how they spring up and grow, and what their uses are. Stress is laid upon the fact that there is no break between the mineral, vegetable, and animal worlds.—No. 21 (8) treats of Zoology, following Aristotle mainly. The highest of the animals is man, who forms the link between them and the angels, the bridge between hell and heaven.*—The next nine tracts deal with man, as a physical, sensuous being.—No. 22 (9) investigates the structure of the human body, Anatomy, and finds that man is a microcosm, a state, in which the soul is king, the representative of God on earth, a book written by God's own hand. In knowing himself, man knows God.—No. 23 (10) treats of Sense-perception and the Perceived, and contains a whole physiological theory of cognition. It shows how the senses seize their percepts and carry them to the faculty of imagination, whose organ is in the front part of the brain, whence they pass on to the faculty of judg-

* This tract contains a delightful story entitled "The Case of the Animals vs. Man before the King of the Genii." The scene is laid on an island in the Indian Ocean. The animals, claimed by men as slaves, plead their own cause, and present a picture of human injustice and cruelty that is truly appalling. Men are defeated at every point, and the case would go against them, but for the fact of their immortality. On the ground of this, that men are ends in themselves, the king of the genii counsels the animals to serve them, but strongly enjoins on men to treat them kindly, and not overtax them. The deep human feeling of this story bears testimony to the high culture of the "Brothers of Sincerity." Translated by Dieterici under the title, *Der Streit zwischen Thier und Mensch*, Berlin, 1858.

ment, in the middle part of the brain, where they are again distinguished and seized in their true essence. Hence, again, they pass on to the faculty of retention, in the hinder part of the brain, where they lie ready to be recalled into consciousness by reminiscence. From this they proceed to the faculty of speech, which lies above the tongue, and by which they are translated into words, which, when accompanied by meanings, issuing from the soul, form significant speech. Hence, also, they proceed to the faculty of action, whose organs are the hands. These record them in books, to be preserved for future generations. Thus the experience of the race is accumulated and preserved in literature.—No. 24 (11) deals with the Process of Generation, Conception, and Birth, the union of the soul with the embryo, and the influence of the stars upon the temperament and character of the child. Here we have a whole system of Astrology, as affecting human character.—No. 25 (12) treats of Man as a Microcosm, in form similar to the Macrocosm, and having equivalents to the angels, genii, satans, and animal spirits of the latter, and shows that he resumes in himself the corporeal and spiritual worlds and the meaning of all that exists.—No. 26 (13) treats of the Partial Soul, showing how it grows through the human body, and how it may, before or after death, become an angel.—No. 27 (14) investigates the Limits of Human Knowledge, and shows that man may attain to a knowledge of his Creator.—No. 28 (15) treats of Life and Death and the meaning of them, showing why the rational soul is united with the body till death, which is to be welcomed as a spiritual birth.—No. 29 (16) considers the Nature of Spiritual and Bodily Pain and Pleasure, and how these

are felt by disembodied spirits.—No. 30 (17) treats of the Nature and Function of Language, and shows how there came to be different languages.

Having thus obtained a description of sensible nature, we next arise to a consideration of its system, as an expression of reason and a norm of ethical life. It is a characteristic of all mediæval thought from the days of the Neo-Platonists onwards, that, in making the system of the visible world a manifestation of goodness, reason, and soul, it makes it ethical. Its universe is an emanation from God, diminishing in intensity as, by receding from him, it divides into many. The nearer anything is to the One, the higher is its grade of being. He (1) is above subsistence, completion, perfection. From Him emanate (2) Reason, subsistent, complete, perfect; through Reason (3) Soul, subsistent and complete; through both of these (4) Primal Matter, which is merely subsistent. God is "the One, the Pure," standing to the universe in the same relation as unity to number. Reason, answering to duality, is, because it emanates from God, who is; it subsists, because God continually pours upon it His overflow of good; it is complete, because it accepts this overflow; it is perfect, because it communicates this overflow to the Soul. The Soul subsists, because it emanates from Reason, which subsists; it is complete, because Reason pours upon it the overflow received from God; it is not perfect, because it cannot again communicate this overflow to Primal Matter, for the reason that this, not being complete, cannot receive it. The Soul, therefore, finds itself in this position, that, unless it can make matter complete, it can never itself be perfect. Its whole effort, therefore, is to complete matter. In its endeavor to pour out the

divine overflow upon it, it creates the physical universe, whose incompleteness is shown by its motion; for the complete moves not. In this way are formed (5) Secondary, or Tri-dimensional Matter, *i.e.*, Body (6), the Extended Universe; (7) Nature, sublimary and transient; (8) the Four Elements; (9) Things or Products. In these, the Soul having at last reached the lowest depth of multiplicity, begins a process of unification, whereby it perfects itself and completes matter. This is called the Return (Ma'ad, sometimes rendered Resurrection). It is exactly what we should call Evolution, whose existence is thus accounted for. Under the unifying influence of the Soul, Matter becomes, first, minerals, then plants, then animals, and, lastly, man, who gradually ascends above transience, through the various moving spheres, until he reaches the quiet heaven of the Universal Soul, which can now pour upon him the divine overflow. Through this he turns to pure, complete, perfect Reason; through it he becomes perfect, and enters into direct union with God. Thus the whole process of the universe is a going forth from the absolute unity of God to the absolute multiplicity of matter, and back again from this to the unity of God. The world is from God and to God.*

(III) *The Rational World-Soul*

No. 31 (1) discusses the Principles of Reason, according to Pythagoras, and shows how God, in creating, arranged the world on a basis of number drawn from

* See *Theology of Aristotle*, Book X. ; *Liber de Causis*, § 21 (Edit. Bar-denheuer). In a system like this there is no distinction between Creation and Fall. The Creation is the Fall, just as the Return is Redemption. God creates, the Soul redeems. The Mystic Trinity is God, Reason, Soul.

unity.—No. 32 (2) states the Principles of Reason, according to the “Brothers of Sincerity,” and gives the grounds for the origin of the world, and the mediate causes for all existence.—No. 33 (3) discusses the saying of the philosophers, that the Universe is a Great, Good Man, endowed with intellect and soul, a living world, obedient to its master.—No. 34 (4) deals with Reason and its Object, Being, and the true nature of the substance of the Soul.—No. 35 (5) treats of the Revolutions of the Stars and Spheres, and shows that the world came into being, and will again go out of being.—No. 36 (6) treats of the Love of the Soul, its nature and origin, and shows that the object of this love is God, for whom all creatures long.—No. 37 (7) deals with the Return or Resurrection.—No. 38 (8) deals with the Various Kinds of Motion, and shows how the world proceeded from the Creator.—No. 39 (9) treats of Causes and Effects, and shows that they form a continuous circle. Here we are shown the origin, rules, and arrangement of the sciences, and taught that the universe is a self-determined whole.—No. 40 (10) treats of Definitions and Determinations, and tries to show the ideal essence of things, simple and compound.

(IV) *The Divine Law, or Revelation*

No. 41 (1) treats of Opinions, Doctrines, Dogmas, Religions, Prophecy. It shows that all philosophies and all religions seek the salvation of the soul, and try to point out the way whereby it ascends from the hell of the lower world to the paradise of the spheres—the path of mystic vision.—No. 42 (2) treats of the Way to God, and shows that it leads through the civic and cathartic virtues up

to the theoretic, by which death, resurrection, and eternal reward or punishment are contemplated.—No. 43 (3) exhibits the Faith and Teachings of the “Brothers of Sincerity.” This faith includes a belief in individual immortality.—No. 44 (4) describes the Life of the Brothers, which, if somewhat monastic, was full of sweet reason and love.*—No. 45 (5) seeks to show the Philosophic Content of Islâm, and to explain the meaning of Inspiration and Obsession.—No. 46 (6) discusses the Nature of the Revealed Law, the Conditions of Prophecy, the Qualifications of Prophets, and the Teachings of the Servants of God. Its purpose is to show how the sacred writings have to be interpreted in order to be brought into harmony with philosophy. Here allegory plays a large part.—No. 47 (7) treats of the Call to God, to Sincerity and Love, and shows that the Kingdom of truth and goodness must begin with a small knot of men who write and agree to lead a certain life, and propagate a certain doc-

* They had formed themselves into groups or lodges, for the pursuit of study, and a common life of purity, simplicity, and helpfulness. Their social bond was friendship or love, and the guide of their life science, which they welcomed in all its forms. They professed to draw their knowledge from four kinds of books, (1) Books on the Matter and Form of Knowledge (Aristotle's Logic, etc.); (2) Books of Revelation (Torah, Gospel, Psalms, Qorân, etc.); (3) Books on Physics and Human Productions; (4) Books on Mystic Philosophy (Neo-Platonic chiefly). They recognized four grades of spiritual attainment, and divided themselves into four classes corresponding to these: (1) The *Technics*, whose virtues were purity of soul-substance, quick comprehension and rapid presentation, and whose course extended from their fifteenth to their thirtieth year; (2) the *Directors*, whose virtues were directive power, generosity, gentleness, sympathy and compassion, and whose course extended from thirty to forty; (3) the *Kings* or *Rulers*, whose virtue was power to command and forbid, to overcome and determine, with a view to suppressing, with gentleness, insubordination, and whose course extended from forty to fifty; (4) the *Angels*, whose virtue was divine insight or inspiration, by which they rose to a vision of the Eternal, and of the future life, and the way thither, who had complete authority over the Brothers, whose course lasted till their death, when they ascended to God as ministering angels. Cf. last lines of *Golden Words*.

trine.—No. 48 (8) treats of the Actions of Spiritual Beings, and shows that there exist incorporeal, active essences in the world.—No. 49 (9) deals with the different Forms of Government, the Grades of Rulers, and the Character of the Ruled. God is the supreme ruler, and the best earthly ruler is he that stands nearest to Him.—No. 50 (10) treats of the Universe as an Ordered Hierarchy of Beings, proceeding from God, and returning to God.*—No. 51 (11) treats of Witchcraft, Philtres, Evil Eye, Omens, Amulets, Talismans, Genii, Satans, Angels, and their relations and acts.

Such is the *Encyclopædia*, or educational curriculum of the “Brothers of Sincerity.”† It must, as a whole, be abandoned, as incompatible with demonstrated truth; much of it must be rejected, as pure superstition. Yet it claims our interest for several reasons: (1) It sums up the best thought of a long, momentous period in the history of culture, a period in which man “rose from nature to spirit,” and, indeed, is the very form of that process. (2) It has its roots in all the past of humanity, and its branches in all its future: it is the complete scheme of mediæval science. (3) It is all-comprehensive, including nature and spirit, and showing that the former has its origin in the latter. (4) It does its best to harmonize reason with revelation.‡ (5) It shows man his place in the universe, his origin, his destiny, and, therefore, his duty. (6) It thus furnishes a complete education, en-

* See *Qorân*, XXI., 104.

† It presupposed primary instruction in reading, writing, grammar, versification, and arithmetic.

‡ It shows the dangers with which such attempts are necessarily beset, because they assume a dualism that does not exist. A superrational revelation made to reason is a contradiction in terms.

abling its recipient to lead a rational, aimful, and, therefore, free life.

The system, including, as it does (1) Propædeutics, (2) Physics, (3) Metaphysics, (4) Theology, is complete in every part. Though, like all systems prior to the rise of experimental science, it assumes all the knowable to be known, and so presents itself as final, an absolute norm for life and thought, it has many merits. On the intellectual side, it taught men to look upon themselves as having their origin and end in the one supreme principle of the universe, and as being essential parts of the sum of existence. On the emotional side, it made them feel that the entire universe was only their larger self, and that, since the same soul pulsated in all things, in wronging others, they were wronging themselves. Thus, universal love and tenderness became the dominant principles of their lives. On the volitional side, it made them seek to elevate the living world nearer and nearer to God, and to instruct, purify, and discipline the souls of their fellows.*

We may well ask why a system, with such merits, did not succeed. The answer is that it was many generations ahead of its time: the world was not ready for such a gospel. To live by insight and reason implies a degree of culture rare at any time, and certainly not common in Iraq in the year 1000. Among the men who flattered themselves that they could so live was a contemporary of the "Brothers," Ibn Sina, one of the greatest of all thinkers; and his life offered an example that did not invite imitation. His outspoken rationalism roused the

* Like all pantheistic systems, it tended to produce quietism and a dreamy, unvolitional existence.

fanaticism of the Arabs, and found expression in the writings of the sceptical mystic,* Al Ghazzâlî (1059–1111), whose name closes the list of Eastern Muslim thinkers. After him, a harsh, rigid orthodoxy, set off against a gross, material, disingenuous mysticism, both equally hostile to education, triumphed, as it still triumphs,† in the East. In the course of the eleventh century all that remained of Arabic philosophic writings found its way thence to Spain, giving rise to a philosophic movement of much promise, that lasted for a century. Among these writings was the *Encyclopædia* of the “Brothers of Sincerity,” introduced about 1020–1030. Here it influenced, not only the Arab thinkers of the West, but also, and in a higher degree, the Jewish, and, ultimately, the Christian thinkers. The famous work of Ibn Tufail (died 1185), *Hayy ibn Yokdhan*, still a favorite among the Quakers, borrows much from it, and so does the great work of the Jew Ibn Gabirol (Avicbron), *Meqor Hayyim*, which largely influenced the Christian Schoolmen.‡ We shall meet this influence further on

* Al Ghazzâlî and his mysticism were both of Persian, or, in the last resort, Syrian origin.

† See Gobineau, *Les Religions et Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale*, Cap. V.

‡ See Joel, *Etwas über den Einfluss der jüdischen Philosophie auf die christliche Scholastik*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie*, Vol. I.

DIVISION II.

MEDIÆVAL EDUCATION

CHAPTER I.

PERIOD OF CHARLES THE GREAT

The end of the ancient world was also the starting-point of mediæval history. The former closed its career with the transcendental doctrines of the Christian faith; the latter began its course with these. These doctrines were the spring of mediæval culture. The whole content of human existence was subordinated to aims lying beyond the present world. . . . The upbuilding of the Christian theocratic state, with which the epoch of the ancient peoples had closed, became the problem of the mediæval world.—VAN EICKEN, *Mittelalt. Weltansch.*, p. 151.

The conceptions of the Divine and the Good, drawn from sensible nature, were already the first steps to a breach with nature. The principle of the natural would have led the Germanic myth, as it had once done the Greek, beyond itself. The life of nature was already poetized into a tragedy, and the change in things traced back to moral guilt. Clearly, the continuation of the myth would have resulted among the Germans, also, in a principal denial of nature. But this evolution was interrupted by the introduction of Christianity. The thought of an opposition between nature and spirit remained undeveloped in the depths of the myth.—*Ibid.*, p. 160.

Christianity is asceticism and theocracy.—HARNACK, *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. III., p. 298.

Law is mighty, mightier is need.—GOETHE, *Faust*, Pt. II.

When education revived in Europe, after the darkness of the eighth century, it was no longer among the Latin peoples, but among their conquerors, the Germans. With these an altogether new phase of education begins. If, thus far, education had aimed at subordinating the individual to the social whole, or its ruler, its task now is to free the individual, to give him validity in the face of all institutions. Of this task it only slowly became conscious; indeed, it is not completely conscious of it now.

When the Germanic tribes overcame and broke down the civic empire of Rome, they themselves were overcome by the Semitized, supernatural empire which had long been undermining and replacing it, that is, by Christianity, which had fallen heir to its imperial and legal forms.* And, indeed, they could hardly have desired anything better. The passionate, untamable individuality of the Germans, which even the necessity of combination, and subordination to chiefs, in their long struggle with the Romans had but slightly modified, could have found no better corrective than the awesome supernaturalism of Roman Christianity. This appealed, in a powerful way, to their profoundly superstitious natures, and, though it never succeeded in completely conquering their individualism and imparting that political consistency which is essential to the founding of a great empire, it enabled them to play an important part in the world. The history of the Middle Age, and, to a large extent, even that of modern times, is the record of a struggle between Roman coercive organization and German individualism, and the end is not yet. But,

* See Von Eicken, *Mittelalterliche Weltanschauung*, pp. 159 seq.

with all her Roman tendency to coercion, the Church, almost in spite of herself, contributed powerfully to the development of the higher, rational individualism, by dividing men's allegiance. In the ancient world, the individual belonged, soul and body, to the State; in the mediæval world, he belonged, with his body to the State,* with his soul to the Church, and it was through the latter that he finally conquered for himself a sphere independent of the former. The most unworldly element in Christianity, viz., Mysticism, was the great breeder of individual freedom.†

The revival of study in mediæval Europe was due to the influence of Irish or Scottish‡ monks. Ireland was Christianized by the British St. Patrick, about A.D. 432, and a century later became the seat of stern piety and learning. The old Græco-Roman curriculum of studies seems to have continued there. Thus, when the withdrawal of the Romans from Britain left that country, with its churches and schools, to the mercy of the Picts and confusion, learning flourished in a land where the Roman eagles never flew. Hence, under the influence of the Irish St. Columba (Colum, Colme), and his great monastery in Iona (Colme-Kill), it spread among the Picts, and had made considerable progress by the year 600, when Roman Christianity began to spread among the Anglo-Saxons. Though there were considerable differences between Irish and Roman Christianity, and

* See the closing sections of Dante's *De Monarchia*, and cf. Villari, *Saggi di Storia di Critica e di Politica*, pp. 37-93.

† See Preger, *Die deutsche Mystik, passim*, and Tocco, *L'Eresia nel Medio Evo*, pp. 261-559 (Book II).

‡ Till about the tenth century Scotia means Ireland, and Scot means Irish. In the ninth century, however, John the Scot found it necessary to add Eriugena to his name.

the Iro-Pictish church was independent of Rome, there was no hostility between the two. The learned Irish monks, who carried their discipline and their learning all over Europe, even to Iceland, before its discovery by the Norsemen in 864,* were willing to impart these to their catholic brethren. Thus, by the middle of the seventh century, cloister schools had begun to rise in the north of England—at Yarrow, Wearmouth, York, etc. At the same time, the Greek, Theodore of Tarsus, first archbishop of Canterbury, was laboring to give learning a seat in the south. In a very little time Anglo-Saxon missionaries and teachers were following in the wake of their Irish brethren, and helping to revive education on the continent. They seem to have devoted special attention to the Franks, who had become catholics under Chlodowech, in 496, and who were now rising in political importance in consequence.† Among these pioneers were Egbert, Wilfrid, and Willebrod (died 739). More famous than these was Wynfrith, who assumed the Latinized name Bonifatius, and whom Pope Gregory II appointed as papal vicar in southern Germany. Under this man‡ and his Anglo-Saxon com-

* See the *Islendinga-bók*, near the beginning.

† The conversion of Chlodowech and his Franks to Catholicism was a great turning-point in history. The Christianity of the Germanic tribes had for the most part been Arianism, while that of the Romanized populations, among whom they settled as conquerors, was Catholicism. This naturally produced antagonism between the two nationalities, and greatly weakened the Germans. To put an end to this, Chlodowech, by a wonderful stroke of policy, became a Catholic, and at once had all the influence of the Catholic bishops and church on his side. His Franks were widely welcomed, as deliverers from heresy, and his dominions rapidly extended. See Von Eicken, *Mittelalt. Weltanschauung*, pp. 169-212.—It may be noted here that the oldest known specimen of any Germanic tongue is the Gospels of Ulfilas, Arian Bishop of the Moeso-Goths, on the lower Danube, about A.D. 360.

‡ He was finally driven from his position by the civil power, and died a martyr's death among the Frisians in 755.

patriots, male and female, the organization and discipline of the Roman church were introduced everywhere in the Frankish dominions, which now occupied nearly all that had been covered by the Roman empire, except what was occupied by Islâm and Constantinople. This was done, at first, without the co-operation of the civil power; but this also was soon obtained, and a close bond established between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, a bond which in the sequel had much significance. When, in 747, Pippin became master of the whole Frankish domain, which had been broken up into separate kingdoms since the death of Chlodowech, he did his best to further catholic belief and discipline among his people, and to strengthen the bond between his power and the Roman See by an exchange of benefits.

This was the condition of things when Charles, surnamed the Great, became sole ruler of the Frankish dominions (771 A.D.). He was truly a great man, in that he clearly saw the needs of his time and strove to meet them. These needs were, above all, unity of sentiment among the various subject peoples, and education. Fully recognizing that the civil power was unequal to this great task, and seeing no help anywhere save in the Church, he did his best to work through it, meaning to keep it under his control. His efforts were so successful that on Christmas day, A.D. 800, he was crowned Roman Emperor by the Pope, in St. Peter's, and the chief seat of civil authority in the Western World transferred from the Græco-Latin to the Germanic peoples, an event of infinite significance. At the same time, the Frankish church came to stand for Western Christianity,

effecting changes even in the creed. In fact, Charles was complete master, in both State and Church.*

Long before his coronation, Charles had taken measures to promote education among his subjects by drawing to his court learned men from different countries. Most prominent among these was the Anglo-Saxon Alcuin,† who went from the school of York to Aachen, in 782, to become head of the "Palace School." As such, he is usually regarded as the father of mediæval education. This, as we shall see, is not quite correct; for that education had more than one father. Besides, the movement initiated by Charles belonged, in character, rather to the ancient than to the mediæval world, whose distinguishing Mysticism had not yet come into prominence. Alcuin's aim was to restore the education of the days of St. Augustine, including even its pagan elements. Although he probably knew nothing of Martianus Capella, he championed the "Seven Liberal Arts," and deprecated every departure from them. He was, indeed, in all ways, authority-bound and conservative, manifesting no originality anywhere; as was well, considering the conditions under which he worked. Deeply influenced by St. Augustine, he aimed, in all that he did, to prepare men for the life to come. He deprecated all frivolity, and even play, in his pupils. Of science he had not an inkling: his definitions are often childish and worse. His style is florid, unnatural, and allegorical, sometimes a mere cento of scripture-passages, shamelessly wrested from their natural meaning.

* See Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. III., pp. 244-274.

† Alcuin, born near York about 735; entered the cathedral school as a mere child; became its master in the prime of life, and conducted it with much success; was transferred to Aachen in 782; became Bishop of Tours, 796; died there, 804. See West's *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*.

And yet Alcuin was a great and valuable man in his day. Under his influence, and that of Charles, education took a fresh start in the West. It consisted of three grades—(1) primary education given by the parish priests; (2) secondary education, imparted in connection with the cathedrals and in the monasteries; and (3) higher education, confined to the Palace School, the parent, in some sense, of the later universities. In all, the standard of instruction, from our point of view, was incredibly low; but it is doubtful whether more could have been accomplished in those days. One great drawback was the scarcity of books, and even of material on which to write; another was the repressive influence of the Roman church, which was more and more aiming at universal sway, and, therefore, naturally averse to anything that might cause dissension.*

Nearly all the prominent teachers of the next generation were pupils or friends of Alcuin. Most famous among these was Hraban Maur,† the “first instructor of Germany,” and a much greater man than his master. He composed several works on education—*On the Instruction of the Clergy*; *On Reckoning*; *An Excerpt on the Grammatical Art of Priscian*; *On the Universe*. The first of these treats of the various branches of study, the Seven Liberal Arts, etc., and shows a just appreciation of the value of pagan learning. The last is a kind of universal encyclopædia, somewhat on the plan of

* In West's *Alcuin* is a list of Alcuin's educational and other works, pp. 183-191; and also a list of the principal works to which he had access, pp. 34 seq.

† Born at Mainz, 776; sent early to the abbey of Fulda, founded in 744 by Bonifatius; went with others to Tours in 802 to study under Alcuin; returned in 803 to Fulda, and taught with great success till 822, when he became abbot; retired into privacy, 842; made archbishop of Mainz, 847; died near Mainz, 856.

Isidore's *Etymologiæ*, and treats of everything, from creation to cooking. The path pursued by Hraban might have led to a revival of ancient learning in the ninth century, had not unforeseen influences come into play. As it was, the work done by Alcuin, Hraban, and their many followers was not done in vain. In the troublous century that followed the death of Charles the Great, when his empire was divided and disordered, though education suffered, it never died out, but lived on in the hands of such men as Servatus Lupus (805–862), Haymo (died 853), Walafried Strabo (807– ?), Luitpert (died 853), Paschasius Ratpert (died 865), Werembert (died 884), Eric of Auxerre (834–881?), Hucbald (died circ. 930), and Odo of Cluny (880–942), till the middle of the tenth century, when a new spirit took possession of Western Europe.

CHAPTER II.

SCHOLASTICISM AND MYSTICISM

The mystical teaching of the Middle Age has its origin chiefly in the writings falsely attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, writings which probably belong to about the end of the fourth century. The speculation of the Pseudo-Dionysius is an attempt to regard Christianity from the point of view of Neo-Platonism, and with the help of this to show it to be the true philosophy.—PREGER, *Deutsche Mystik*, Vol. I., p. 148.

A mystic who is not a Catholic is a dilettante.—HARNACK, *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. III., p. 377.

Mysticism is Catholic piety in general, in so far as this is not mere obedience to the Church, that is, *fides implicita*.—*Ibid.* p. 375.

If any one shall say that the married state is to be preferred to the state of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or celibacy than to be joined in matrimony, let him be accursed (*anathema*). Canon of the Council of Trent.—DENZINGER, *Enchiridion*, § 856.

The epoch of Charles the Great is a sort of passageway, connecting the ancient with the mediæval world. It is half-worldly and pagan, while mediævalism is unworldly and Christian. The belief, widely current in the tenth century, that the world was coming to an end, was not altogether mistaken, though its form was. At that time, an old world passed away, and a new one was

born, with new ideals and a new practice, deeply affecting education.

The influences which brought about this change were, mainly, three—(1) the confusion and distress due to the dismemberment of Charles' empire, and the inroads of the fierce Norsemen, (2) the introduction of Oriental Mysticism, (3) the rise and spread of Islâm. All these tended to make the Church and her supernatural, supermundane ideals the centre of life, and to withdraw men from the ways of the world. And this is mediævalism. Of the first of these influences and its disorganizing effects it is hardly necessary to speak. They made life so unsafe and burdensome as to drive large numbers of men and women into the cloister, to occupy themselves with the world to come. The second influence, Oriental Mysticism, which gave content to that world, and pointed the way thither, came from the schools of Ireland, which had remained outside the Catholic church, and clung to Greek learning. About the middle of the ninth century, John Scot Eriugena,* the most profound thinker of those ages, gave to the world a Latin translation of the mystic works of the Pseudo-Dionysius, with an extensive commentary, drawing on the writings of Maximus Confessor and other Greeks. These works, though at first regarded with suspicion by the Church, were so much in accord with the tendencies of the time that they soon found the widest acceptance, and furnished the foundation for that monkish, mystic, world-fleeing view of life which distinguished the Middle Age. The third influence, Islâm, which, claiming to be the latest and

* This is the correct form of this word. John was born about A.D. 810, educated in Ireland, placed by Charles the Bald at the head of the Palace School, died in France about 877. His great original work was *De Divisione Naturæ*, whose importance long remained unrecognized.

highest divine revelation, had come into conflict with Latin Christianity early in the eighth century, had the effect of waking Christendom from its supernatural slumbers, and compelling it to state its position definitely, as opposed to the new faith.* Whereas the thinkers of the patristic period had spent their efforts in defining particular dogmas, rarely, except in the cases of Origen and Augustine, attempting to present a systematic body of doctrine, thinkers were now called upon to define clearly all the Christianity meant, in order to create a unitary consciousness, clearly aware of the distinction between itself and that of Islâm. It was this call that gave rise to Scholasticism, which, in the eleventh century came to reduce to rational form the prevailing Mysticism, to draw out static contemplation into dynamic reasoning.†

While Mysticism, as mere contemplation, was drawing men away from the life of the world, education, naturally enough, languished. The old Græco-Roman learning, which had been partially revived in the time of Charles the Great and the century that followed, gradually disappeared again, giving place to a cloistral discipline, whose aim was to withdraw men's thoughts from civic life, and from nature with its manifold phenomena, and to fix them upon the supernatural and the

* Muhammad had placed his creed in direct opposition to that of Christianity, by pointedly denying, in one brief surah (cxii) of the Qorân, the two fundamental dogmas of the latter, the Trinity and the Incarnation: "Say, He is One God, God Eternal. He begets not, nor is begotten, and there is no one equal to him."

† It is a great mistake to oppose Scholasticism to Mysticism. The former is merely the explication of what is implicit in the latter. Thomas Aquinas, the prince of scholastics, is quite as much of a Mystic as Bernard, the Prince of Mystics. See Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, Vol. III., pp. 314 seq.

changeless One of Neo-Platonic speculation. What were grammar, rhetoric, logic, and the rest, to men who were straining every faculty in order to attain the vision of God? They could, at best, be but hindrances, and so, indeed, they were regarded. From about the middle of the tenth century to the end of the eleventh, when Mysticism, as yet hardly touched by reflection, was celebrating its chief triumphs, civic life, and with it, education, always connected with that life, sank to a very low ebb,* Education did not, indeed, altogether die out; but it hardly went beyond teaching novices to read the church-service and the favorite books of edification.† About the year 1100, a change, due to two causes, becomes visible. The attacks of the Norsemen had ceased, and Europe was once more settling down to a tolerable civic life. At the same time, the growing power and culture of Islâm, which, as early as 732, had reached Tours and Poitiers and, later on, had taxed the energies of Charles

* The Mystic movement had its chief centre in the Burgundian abbey of Clugny, which furnished the Church with many of its most ardent champions, including Gregory VII., the most papal of all the popes. See Müller, *Kirchengesch.*, Vol. I., pp. 384 seq.

† The condition of education about the year 1000 comes out with much clearness in the life of the Auvergnat monk, Gerbert, who died as Pope Sylvester II., in 1003. This indefatigable student and reformer was born in Auvergne about 950, entered the abbey of Aurillac as a child, studied at the abbey of Vich, in Spain, 967-970, met Pope John XIII. and the Emperor Otto I. in Italy in 971 (?); studied philosophy at Reims in 972; became abbot of Bobbio in 983; returned to Reims, 984; helped to elect Hugh Capet King of France, 987; bishop of Reims, 991; retired to Italy, 996; bishop of Ravenna, 998; pope 999-1003. In the last capacity he endeavored, in concert with Otto III., to revive the Roman Empire, a fact which shows that he had not succumbed to the mystical tendency. His efforts to obtain books, and his wanderings in search of the elements of learning, show how low learning had fallen in his time. His acquisitions, which were modest enough, were yet so unusual for his time that he earned himself the reputation of being a wizard, and went down to posterity as such. See Picavet, *Gerbert, un Pape Philosophe, d'après l'Histoire et d'après la Légende* (Paris 1897). Along with Gerbert should be mentioned Notker Laëo, a monk of St. Gall, who died in 1022. For an interesting picture of him, and of cloistral school life in the tenth century, see Scheffel's novel, *Ekkehard*.

the Great, placed the Church, which now aspired to rule the world by denying it, in an attitude of self-defence, demanding education. Her dogmatic system had to be justified, and this could be done only with the arms of reason. Thus, about the date named, the seeds sown long before by Alcuin and Gerbert began to bear fruit. Alongside such Platonizing mystics as Anselm (1033–1109) and Bernard (1091–1153), arose men of Aristotelian tendencies, *e. g.*, Roscellinus (1050–1120?) and Abélard (1079–1142), who did their best to revive education and thought. These two men mark so important an epoch in education that we must devote some attention to them.

The great question which agitated Christian Europe, about A.D. 1100, related to the dogma of the divine Trinity, which, as we have seen, Muhammad had denied. This involved the whole problem of the nature of knowledge, or, as it was then called, the problem of Universals—of Realism and Nominalism. It was this that gave rise to Scholasticism, or mediæval science. The question had been stated long before by Porphyry in his Introduction (*Εἰσαγωγή*), but set aside as too difficult for discussion: “With regard to genera and species, whether they have actual subsistence, or consist merely in pure thoughts, and whether, if they do subsist, they are corporeal or incorporeal; transcendent, or immanent in, and related to, sensible things, I shall not endeavor to decide, and this for the reason that the question is an extremely profound one, requiring another and deeper investigation.”* What Porphyry shrank from, was forced upon the men of the twelfth century by the ne-

* *Isagoge*, near begin.; cf. Hauréau, *De la Philos. Scolastique*, Vol. I., p. 35; Ueberweg, *Grundriss etc.*, Pt. II., p. 141 (7th Edit.).

cessities of Christian dogma. Is God a subsistent reality, or a mere generalization in thought from the three divine persons? The Platonists and Mystics (Anselm, Bernard), took one view, the Aristotelians (Roscellinus, Abélard), the other. With the question itself we have no concern here, further than to say that it revived the science of dialectic and, in course of time, all the sciences or disciplines of the ancient world, and made education necessary.

Though Roscellinus is justly regarded as the parent of anti-mystic Nominalism, this revival is due to his pupil, Abélard,* more than to any other one person. The romantic history of this man and his wife, Héloïse, are too well-known to require treatment here. Abélard was the first modern man; Héloïse, the first modern woman. With all their faults, they were profoundly human. We must not, however, conclude from this, as is sometimes done, that he meant to be unorthodox, or sought to rebel against the doctrines of the Church. Far from it! He merely tried to fortify these doctrines, by placing them upon a rational foundation. In so far, he may, indeed, be called the parent of modern rationalism and science. He had great respect for certain pagan thinkers, especially for Plato and Aristotle, of whose works, however, he knew but little.† He called himself a Peripatetic, and believing, like all mediæval men, that

* See Rémusat, *Abélard*, 2 vols., Paris, 1845; Deutsch, *Peter Abälard, ein kritischer Theologe des zwölften Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1883; and above all his own *Historia Calamitatum*, forming the first of the Letters of Abélard and Héloïse. His works were published by Cousin: *Petri Abaelardi Opera, hactenus seorsim Edita*, Paris 1849-59 (2 vols.), and *Ouvrages Inédits d'Abélard*, Paris, 1836.

† Of Plato he probably knew a portion of the *Timæus*; of Aristotle the *Categories*, *Interpretation*, *Topica*, and *Elenchi Sophistici*—the "Old Logic"—with the *Introduction* of Porphyry. His pupil, Peter the Lombard, does not once cite Aristotle.

all truth had already been discovered or revealed, and only required elucidation, he made no pretence of originality. But he was a powerful and impressive elucidator, and this constitutes his merit. More than any man of his time, he attracted and inspired pupils, compelling them to think and inquire. He confined his attention chiefly to Dialectic, Ethics, and Theology, on all of which he wrote valuable treatises, some of which brought him into conflict with the Church, and especially with the Mystical movement, at that time headed by Bernard, who was his bitterest enemy.*

Abélard founded no school; but he gave a mighty impulse to thought and education, while several of his pupils, Peter the Lombard (1100?–1164), author of the famous *Sentences*, so long the chief theological textbook, Arnold of Brescia (1102?–1155), John of Salisbury (1102–1180), etc., did yeoman's service in the cause of enlightenment. He may fairly be called the inventor of the "scholastic method,"† which afterwards became so powerful a weapon in the hands of Thomas Aquinas and others. But perhaps his chief merit lies in the fact that his influence largely contributed to the founding of the universities, which began some half century after his death. To these we must now turn.

* In his *Dialogue between a Philosopher, a Jew and a Christian*, though he gives the victory to the last, he strives to be fair to all three disputants.

† See Picavet, *Abélard et Alexandre de Hales, Créateurs de la Méthode Scolastique*, in *Etudes de Critique et d'Histoire*, Ser. II., Vol. VII., pp. 209–230. This method consists in citing all known authorities on both sides of a given question, then drawing an orthodox conclusion, and then, by a variety of distinctions and devices, showing how each authority may be reconciled with this conclusion. It assumes that all truth is to be found in authorities, and that these, when properly interpreted, are in agreement. It is, of course, opposed to all free thought and to all original research; but it is a wonderful sharpener of the wits, a "mental gymnastic."

CHAPTER III.

THE MEDIEVAL UNIVERSITIES

I have now, alas ! thoroughly, with ardent care, studied philosophy, jurisprudence, medicine, and, the more's the pity, also theology ! And now I stand here, poor fool, and am as wise as I was before.—GÖTHE, *Faust*, Scene I.

The ancient world may fairly be said to have possessed universities, that is, institutions in which all the learning of the time was imparted. Such institutions existed at Alexandria (Museum and Serapeum), Athens, Constantinople, and later at Berut, Bordeaux, Lyons, Edessa, Nisibis, etc. But the growth of Christian supernaturalism and mysticism, and the inroads of the barbarians from North and South had mostly put an end to these, before A.D. 800. After that date, the Eastern Muslims founded universities in Bagdad, Basra, Cairo,* and other places; but most of these came to an end early in the twelfth century. Then arose in Spain, at Cordova, Toledo, Sevilla, the universities of the Western Muslims, which lasted for about a century, being suppressed by orthodox fanaticism about A.D. 1200. Ibn Rushd, the last great Arab thinker, died in 1198.

* The university of Cairo (Al Azhar) founded about A.D. 900, still exists, and is said to have more students than any university in the world. It is a mere open colonnade attached to a mosque. It confines its instruction to Logic (Porphyry's *Introduction*) and Muslim Theology, based on the Qorān and commentaries. There is another Muslim university at Fez ; but little is known of it.

The Muslim universities may be said to be the parents of the Christian universities. As we have seen, the success of Islâm threatened Christendom, not only politically, but also intellectually and religiously. The brilliant civilizations of Iraq and Spain, with their schools, universities, art, trade, etc., contrasted strongly with the condition of barbarized, squalid Europe. From the time of Charlemagne, the claims of Islâm, and the dangers arising from them were, more or less, understood in Christendom. Christian scholars went to Muslim lands in search of learning. The Crusades made the West familiar with Muslim culture. Early in the twelfth century, Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, and friend of Abélard in his last days, caused the Qorân to be translated into Latin, and, about the same time, Christian students were frequenting the Muslim schools of Spain, and translating Arabic works into the same. Famous among these were Gerhard of Cremona (1124–1187), and Dominicus Gundissalinus, archdeacon of Segovia (of about the same date), who was assisted by the converted Jew, John Apendehut (Ibn Dawud). In this way, soon after the middle of the twelfth century, the learning of the Arab schools was known to Christian Europe. With this learning went a knowledge of Muslim theology, which threatened to work havoc with Christian dogma, and compelled it to defend itself. The brilliant emperor, Frederick II. (1195–12?) surrounded himself with Muslims, among whom were the sons of Ibn Rushd, and was himself almost a Muslim in faith and morals, nay, perhaps altogether a free thinker.*

* See Renan, *Averroès et l'Averroïsme*; Reuter, *Gesch. der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*, Vol. II.; Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, and *Die arabischen Uebersetzungen aus*

The Muslim universities had taken a broad sweep, including in their curriculum, not only the "liberal arts," but also medicine (physics), philosophy, and theology. When they were closed, Christian Europe not only felt the need of universities of its own, but was also able to establish such. It had not sat at the feet of the Muslims in vain.

From the days of Alcuin onwards, a certain small amount of education had existed in Western Europe. Connected with the larger churches were elementary schools where reading was taught; and connected with the cathedrals and monasteries were schools of a somewhat higher order, in which writing, vocal music, a little arithmetic (enough to calculate the date of Easter!) and the elements of theology were imparted. Later on, in the eleventh century, there arose in the larger centres—Paris, Cologne, etc.—institutions of a still higher order, open to all properly prepared students, without distinction. Here were taught dialectic, theology, and perhaps some other branches. About 1100 these last received a fresh impulse, and later, with the influx of Arab learning (1150–1250), an altogether new life and scope, which turned them into universities.*

The name first given to these institutions was *Studium*, or *Studium Generale*, the adjective implying, not that they included all branches of learning in their curriculum, but that, unlike other schools, they were open to the "students" † of all lands. There might be a

dem Griechischen; Jourdain, *Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote*.

* See Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*; Compayré, *Abélard and the Origin and Early History of Universities*.

† In Great Britain, even now, the verb *study*, and the noun *student* are confined to university-work. A school-boy is not a student, nor does he "study his lessons," as in America.

Studium Generale for any particular branch, *e.g.*, medicine. Nevertheless, the *Studia Generalia* did, in course of time, try to include all knowledge in their curriculum.* They were, moreover, endowed with certain privileges, conferred by the Pope, the Emperor, or a prince. The student who took his degree at any *Studium Generale* earned the right to teach anywhere (*facultas ubique docendi*), without further examination. Private institutions, however high their curriculum, could confer no such privilege. The term *University* (*universitas*), which appears somewhat later than *Studium Generale*, means simply corporation, and has no special reference to seats of learning. When a *Studium Generale* was incorporated, it became a University, even though, like the law-university of Bologna, it instructed but in one branch. It was a considerable time before many universities included all the "faculties."

The Arabs seem to have set the example of opening institutions of learning for all the world. When their universities sank, the Christian ones arose. Frederic II. was particularly active in seeking to imitate all the institutions of Muslim civilization. He founded the University of Naples, and tried to make all the students among his subjects attend it (1224). With the exception of Oxford, this was the first university that included all the four faculties—Theology, Law, Arts, (Philosophy) Medicine. But by far the larger number of the universities received their charters from the popes, who were, for the most part, enlightened men, and patrons

* There is no documentary evidence for the use of the term *Studium Generale*, or the equivalent *Studium Universale*, prior to the third quarter of the thirteenth century. Both seem to be translations of the Arabic *Madrasah Kulliyah*, which has the same meaning.

of learning, rarely yielding to the allurements of Oriental mysticism.

That Christian universities existed in fact, before they received official recognition, is certain. That of Salerno, for medicine, dates back to the ninth century, and the same is perhaps true of that of Oxford, whose foundation has often been attributed to King Alfred. For the last fact there is not sufficient documentary evidence; yet it is not unlikely. Learning was not uncommon in Britain in the ninth century, and Alfred was a patron of it, having himself translated Boëtius and Orosius. Certain it is that Oxford had as many students as it has now, at the end of the twelfth century, when the two universities recognized as the oldest, Paris and Bologna, were founded.

But, after all, there is a very important sense in which these two must be recognized as the oldest universities. They are very different from the institutions that went before them, and this for four reasons: (1) the impulse given to inquiry and discussion by men like Abélard; (2) the influx of Arab learning and thought, compelling the Church to state and defend her position; (3) the privileges granted to travelling students by emperors and princes; (4) the incorporation of the teaching bodies, which gave them a legal standing. The critical and dialectic method of Abélard and his followers forms a strong contrast to the dull, catechetical method of Alcuin and the earlier teachers. Compared with the wealth of Arab learning, including Greek philosophy, medicine, and mathematics, the old learning was but as a drop in the bucket. Aristotle alone, with the commentaries of Averroës and others, was little short of a revelation. He

became to the Christians, as he had long been to the Muslims, "the philosopher" whose authority it was a bold thing to dispute.* Students, when travelling, or when residing in seats of learning, were under the protection of emperors and kings, and severe penalties were inflicted upon those who molested them. The charters granted to teaching bodies insured them a permanent existence, enabling them to outstrip and supplant bodies not so privileged. It was owing to this that the *Studia* of Bologna and Paris first rose to the rank of universities. The former received its privileges from Frederic I. (Barbarossa) about 1155; the latter, from Louis VII., some years later. The *Universitas* originally consisted of all the instructors in a given *Studium*. Later, it included the students as well as the teachers. It was only after it was constituted that the teachers began to group themselves into "faculties," each of which managed its own affairs, and of which Paris possessed four as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century.†

It is not possible here to follow the growth of the universities after 1200. Between that date and 1400 their number had risen to nearly forty, scattered over the different countries of the Catholic world. Italy and France had more than all the rest of Europe put together. Scandinavia, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Scotland had none; but as the universities were open to all the world, this did not mean much. Paris and Bologna long retained their prestige and popularity, followed close by Oxford. The later universities were modelled mostly on

* See Talamo, *L'Aristotelismo nella Storia della Filosofia*.

† The philosophic, or arts faculty, acquired special prominence, so much so that its head became "rector" of the entire university. In Aberdeen at the present day, the arts students choose the "Lord Rector."

the first two. The number of students reported as having attended some of the universities in those early days almost passes belief; *e.g.*, Oxford is said to have had 30,000 about the year 1300, and half that number even as early as 1264. The numbers attending the university of Paris were still greater. These numbers become less surprising when we remember with what poor accommodations—a bare room and an armful of straw *—the students of those days were content, and what numbers of them even a single teacher like Abélard could, long before, draw into lonely retreats.† That in the twelfth and following centuries there was no lack of enthusiasm for “study,” notwithstanding the troubled condition of the times, is very clear. The instruction given at the universities, moreover, reacted upon the lower schools, raising their standard and supplying them with competent teachers. Thus, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, education rose in many European states to a height which it had not attained since the days of Seneca and Quintilian. This showed itself in many ways, but above all, in a sudden outburst of philosophy, art, and literature. To these centuries belong Albertus Magnus and Roger Bacon, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura, Cimabue, Giotto and the cathedral-builders, Dante and Petrarch, Chaucer and Gower, the Minnesänger of Germany, and the trouvères and troubadours of France.

It was the great age of Scholasticism;‡ and this word means much. Scholasticism is mediæval science, and

* See Dante *Parad.* X. 137 with Scartazzini's note.

† See Rémusat, *Abélard*, Vol. I., pp. 45, 108.

‡ It is usual to distinguish three periods in Scholasticism (1) Rise 950-1200; (2) flower, 1200-1400; (3) decline, 1400-1600.

this science, instead of turning its attention directly to nature and culture, turned it to ancient authorities, and strove to reach truth by the study, interpretation, and harmonization of them. Science, in the modern sense, hardly existed; philosophy was the handmaid of revealed theology, which pronounced the final word on all disputed questions. The knowledge of God was the end of all research. The culture of the Middle Age is the practical outcome of the principles of Scholasticism.

It is easy to find fault with mediæval science and mediæval education; and, from our modern point of view, they cannot but appear very faulty. The former was authority-bound and blind to nature; the latter consisted mostly of memory-work and subtle disputation—wrangling, as it was called in England. And yet they were exactly what the times needed. Scholasticism was necessary in order (1) to correct the mystical tendencies which were sapping the energies of Europe and withdrawing the best men and women from the life of the world; (2) to put Europe in possession of the rational thought of the ancient world; (3) to counteract the alluring but corrupt influences of Islâm. In a word, it saved Europe from moral suicide, ignorance, and fleshliness. And it did more. By training men's minds in logical method, it paved the way for modern research and science, thereby, to be sure, digging its own grave, as all things temporary in their nature must do.

Göthe, in his *Faust*, has tried to embody the transition from mediæval to modern civilization. In the masquerade scene, in the second part, the two civilizations are represented, respectively, by the two principal groups, the former moving slowly along, like a richly caparisoned

elephant, surmounted by Victory, guided by Astuteness, and accompanied by Fear and Hope in chains; the latter, thundering along as two fire-breathing dragons, surmounted by Wealth, and guided by Poetry, or Free Creative Imagination. The symbolism in both cases is apt enough, and the transition was very real.

Thus far, all education, with the exception, perhaps, of that inculcated by Socrates, has been education for subordination. With the decay of mediævalism, which carried this subordination to its highest point, even into the conscience of the individual, a great change took place. Henceforth education will tend, more or less consciously, to the development of freedom and individualism. The Germanic spirit, which for ages has been struggling against Roman domination, with little success, will now make itself felt and found free states, gradually emancipating themselves from mediævalism and supernaturalism.

CHAPTER IV.

RENAISSANCE, REFORMATION, AND COUNTER-REFORMATION

The truth shall make you free.—John viii. 32.

The superstition in which we have grown up, even when we recognize it, does not lose its power over us. They are not all free who mock at their chains.—LESSING, *Nathan the Wise*.

For, indeed, a change was coming upon the world, the meaning and direction of which even still is hidden from us, a change from era to era. The paths trodden by the footsteps of ages were broken up ; old things were passing away, and the faith and life of ten centuries was dissolving like a dream. Chivalry was dying ; the abbey and the castle were soon together to crumble into ruins, and all the forms, desires, beliefs, convictions of the old world were passing away, never to return. A new continent had risen up beyond the western sea. The floor of heaven, inlaid with stars, had sunk back into an infinite abyss of immeasurable space ; and the firm earth itself, unfixed from its foundations, was seen to be but a small atom in the awful vastness of the universe. In the fabric of habit, which they had so long laboriously built for themselves, mankind were to remain no longer. And now it is all gone—like an unsubstantial pageant faded ; and between us and the old English there lies a gulf of mystery which the prose of the historian will never adequately bridge. They cannot come to us, and our imagination can but feebly penetrate to them. Only among the aisles of the cathedral ; only as we gaze upon their silent figures sleeping in their tombs, some faint conceptions float before us of what these men were when they were alive, and perhaps in the sound of church-bells, that peculiar creation of mediæval age, which falls upon the ear like the echo of a vanished world.—FROUDE, *Henry VII.*, Vol. I., pp. 63 seq.

Enthusiasm for the ancient threatened to replace scholasticism by mere philology and erudition. This meant remaining in books, whereas science is in things.—SÉAILLES, *Léonard de Vinci*, pp. 185 seq.

Mediæval Europe underwent three Renaissances, the first in the eighth century; the second in the twelfth; the third in the fourteenth and fifteenth. The first brought back something of old Roman education; the second introduced Aristotle and the learning of the Arabs; the third resuscitated the whole culture of the ancient Græco-Roman world. The first prepared for the second; the second for the third.

The all-embracing philosophy of Aristotle was especially enlightening and effective. In the thirteenth century, the admiration for it was almost boundless. The great thinkers of the time, such as Albertus Magnus (1193–1280) and Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) used it to express and systematize the dogmas of the Catholic faith, and from that day to this the philosophy of the Catholic Church has been virtually Aristotelianism. But it was impossible to confine his philosophy to this use. His works opened to the mediæval mind a whole new world, by no means compatible with mediæval ideals, and strongly calculated to draw men away from these, so that many able thinkers, including even Dante,* ran the risk of losing their faith and becoming pagan philosophers. The later Scholasticism (Thomism and Scotism) left the mind in anything but the receptive attitude favorable to blind faith, while the higher Mysticism, claiming to place the individual soul in direct relation to God, tended to encourage the belief that the Church

* See the *Convivio* (Banquet) throughout, and *Purgatory*, XXX., 70 seq.

and her ordinances were not essential to salvation, and to strengthen individualism and free thought. This was especially true, when Mysticism, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, began to reflect upon itself and become scholastic. Then arose heresies without number, some of them containing many elements of good, some of them foolish enough.* Hardly one of them thought of going to the root of things; and questioning the principle of authority.

The human mind, thus “awakened from its dogmatic slumbers,” began to look about it, and the results were three important discoveries, and one important invention. The discoveries of the wealth of Greek literature, of America, and of the Copernican astronomy, all rendered triply valuable by the invention of printing, effectively broke up the mediæval world, both physical and moral,† and turned men’s thoughts into entirely new channels—from faith to reason, and from supernature to nature. Henceforth Theology fights a losing battle with Science.‡ In course of time, the new movement eventuated in two great historic events, the Renaissance, or rehabilitation of Nature, and the Reformation, or rehabilitation of Reason, the former in Italy, the latter among the Germanic peoples. The Church, while showing considerable favor for the former, and indeed, never breaking with it, was bitterly opposed to the latter, a fact which caused the great Protestant schism in the sixteenth century.

* See Renter, *Gesch. der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*; and Tocco, *L'Eresia nel Medio Evo*.

† To see how closely connected these were, one must carefully study Dante’s *Divine Comedy*.

‡ See A. D. White, *History of the Warfare of Theology with Science*.


The rehabilitation of Reason, as a human faculty capable of attaining truth, and as the tribunal before which everything claiming to be truth had to show its credentials, and the rehabilitation of Nature, as a revelation of truth to Reason, meant the rehabilitation of science and free philosophy, and these called for an education quite different from the older one, which had consisted mostly of memory-work and subtle disputation about ancient texts; for an education in the observation and sifting of facts and in drawing legitimate conclusions from them, as well as in the conduct of life in accordance with such conclusions. Such is, in brief, the programme of modern education, whose purpose is to enable the individual to live according to truth understood and recognized by himself, and so, dispensing with authority, to live freely.

The transition from mediæval to modern education was not so rapid or marked as might have been expected. The reason for this is clear. The Reformation and the Renaissance, being but half conscious of what was involved in their ideals—Reason and Nature—proved, in practice, to be but half measures, halting between the old and the new, and, in defiance of their own principles, bowing before authority. Luther, the great champion of Reason, was as dogmatic within certain limits as any Church Father, while the champions of Nature counted among their number even popes and cardinals. Hence it was that, for long after the Reformation and Renaissance were in full progress, education remained what it had been before. It was still almost entirely in the hands of clerics, who conducted it according to the old methods, and confined it to the old subjects. Science and scien-

tific methods played no part in it, but remained outside, strongly suspected, and often persecuted, as magic or black-art. Even in England, men were imprisoned for questioning the authority of Aristotle, as late as the seventeenth century, while Giordano Brimo was burnt in Rome in 1600 for fidelity to Nature and the scientific method. The story of Galilei is too well-known to need more than a reference. Indeed, the history of education, from Luther's day to our own, is very largely the history of a struggle between supernaturalism and authority on the one hand, and nature and science on the other. And the struggle is by no means yet at an end.

Nevertheless, from the fifteenth century onward, there are observable four growing tendencies in education—(1) the endeavor to make it natural and practical, instead of abstract and theoretical; (2) the endeavor to include in it care for the body, so sadly neglected and despised in the previous centuries; (3) the endeavor to extend it to all classes of the people, and not merely to clerics, as formerly; (4) the endeavor to adopt gentle and attractive methods, instead of the harsh and repulsive ones formerly in use. We find most of these tendencies in Rabelais (1483–1553), and even in Erasmus (1467–1536), and Montaigne (1533–1592). These were, nominally at least, Catholics; but we find the same tendencies, in perhaps even a stronger degree, among the Protestants. One of them, the effort to extend education to all classes, was a logical outcome of the fundamental principle of the Reformation. People who are expected to accept truth from authority, may be left in ignorance; but people who are expected to judge of truth for themselves, must be educated. The effort at universal education

naturally resulted in the cultivation of the popular dialects and the translation of the sacred writings into them. Up to the date of the Reformation nearly all books of a serious sort were written in Latin; after that date they were composed more and more in the popular dialects.* The advantage to popular education resulting from this change can hardly be overestimated.

 Among the early reformers, the great champions of education were Luther (1483–1546), Melancthon (1479–1560), and Knox (1505–1572). Luther inveighed bitterly against the stupefying educational methods of his time, and demanded public schools and compulsory education of a liberal sort for children of either sex. He discarded the harsh repressive methods of the past, and demanded the children should be treated gently, and allowed to have a large amount of freedom. He made careful provision for the training of teachers, male and female. He showed the limitations of his time, however, when he came to draw up a programme of education. It was to consist of the study of religion, succeeded by that of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, with a little mathematics and logic. Though he himself translated the Bible into German, he left no place for the study of that

* Latin was the official language of the Church, intelligible, for the most part, only to the learned. Wherever it was abandoned, in favor of the popular idioms, we can detect a more or less conscious departure from the spirit and policy of the Church. In Italy, Dante, who writes his noblest works in Italian, is an unsparing censor of the Church. In Germany, the mystics, often sadly unorthodox, write in German. In England, Langland writes in English his *Piers Plowman*, a bitter satire upon the clergy. Chaucer is the contemporary of Wiclif, and so on. In later times, Rabelais and Montaigne write in French, Lionardo da Vinci in Italian, and Luther in German. Thomas More and Francis Bacon write partly in Latin and partly in English. The universities, from sheer inertia and habit, stuck to Latin long after it had been abandoned almost everywhere else. It was a great advantage to Islâm that its sacred book was written in the language of the people, and placed in their hands from the very first.

language. The notion of instruction in science had not even dawned on him; but he recommended the teaching of gymnastics and music. In one respect he was superior to nearly all other educational reformers. He clearly saw that, if ever education was to reach the children of the laboring classes, it must be imparted largely after they had "gone to work." He, accordingly, advised that young people earning their own livelihood should be permitted to attend school one or two hours a day. In this way he may be said to have solved the problem of the education of the working classes, and we have still much to learn from him. On the whole, the education advocated by Luther was of the mediæval sort, but transfused with the modern spirit of humanity and freedom. It had but little effect on subsequent education, even among protestants.

Melanchthon, styled "*Præceptor Germaniæ*," did much to revive higher education, and to introduce an improved method of teaching in the universities. In spite of Luther's bitter denunciations of Aristotle, Melanchthon clung to him, simply because he found that he could not be dispensed with; and this Luther himself ultimately saw. With the consent of the latter, he published works on Aristotelian Logic, Ethics, and Psychology, which long remained the text-books on these subjects. But he introduced no new principle into education or thought. He had no notion of scientific method, and placed authority above truth. He adhered to astrology and the mediæval view of the construction of the universe, and, like Luther, rejected, as contrary to divine revelation (the highest authority for all truth), the Copernican theory. How little he believed in free

discussion is shown by the fact that, like John Knox, he advocated the execution of heretics, and declared the burning of the Unitarian Servetus, by Calvin, to be "a pious and memorable example to all posterity." So unfaithful were these men to the fundamental thought of Protestantism!

John Knox, who, by means of the authority claimed by the Calvinists for the Church of Christ, broke the bonds of feudalism and royal prestige in Scotland, was the chief agent in the establishment of her parish-schools, which have done so much to raise the level of intelligence, capacity, and moral self-respect among her people. Though these schools were specially intended to give instruction in reading, writing, and the elements of religious faith, the Bible being the chief text-book; yet, since the masters were mostly graduates of universities, it was possible for boys to receive in them a complete preparation for these higher institutions. Thus the sons of the poorest peasants and laborers found their way to the universities, and thence into the liberal professions; and the possibility of this imparted an energy-rousing stimulus of hope to every family in the land. In no country in the world have the schools and universities been a greater blessing to the whole body of the people than in Scotland.

The other reformers, Calvin, Zwingli, etc., did comparatively little, in a direct way, to further education. Indeed, the Reformation was, on the whole, such a hesitating and uncertain movement, and its champions were so blind and disloyal to its fundamental principle, and so divided in opinion, that it produced no new philosophy and no new education. It left education subject to au-

thority and in the hands of the clergy. It gave birth to no mighty genius who, grasping the full meaning and scope of the principle of private judgment, could give it expression in a theory and a practice in which authority had no part. The philosophy and education proper to Protestantism did not come till much later, and are, indeed, only beginning to be realized at the present day. The fact is, the rehabilitation of Reason could not produce these things, until it was supplemented by the rehabilitation of Nature. Nature (in the full sense of the term) is the essential content of Reason.

By failing to introduce an education based upon its own principle of freedom, Protestantism left the field open to its opponent, Catholicism, the champion of authority, and this field was almost immediately occupied by one of its most loyal and typical champions, a man devoted, with perfect singleness of heart and indivertibility of aim, to all that it stood and stands for—Ignatius de Loyola,* the mystical, intensely practical founder of the Society of Jesus.

Strictly speaking, the educational system of the Jesuits can scarcely claim a place in a "History of Education as Conscious Evolution," unless we make the last term include evolution backwards; and this we may

* Born in 1491 at the castle of Loyola, Spain; enters the army as a youth; is wounded at Pampeluna (1522); during convalescence reads the Lives of Jesus and the Saints, and resolves to become a soldier of the Cross; has visions at Montserrat and Manresa; makes a pilgrimage to the Holy Land (1524); devotes himself amid great difficulties, and at first with slight success, to study (1524-35); attempts a second visit to the Holy Land but fails on account of war (1537); himself and fellows accepted by the Pope (1539); receives papal charter for his society (1540); draws up a Constitution of his Order (1550 sqq.); dies 1556. See Hughes, *Loyola, or the Educational System of the Jesuits*, in the "Great Educators." Presuming that this book, being written by a member of the society, is at least fair to it, I have drawn my statements very largely from it. Compare, for a very different view, Gioberti, *Il Gesuita Moderno*.

for once do. While the Protestant world was, more or less blindly, struggling to cast off the shackles of authority and rise to freedom, the Society of Jesus, in perfect good faith, and with pious intent, undertook to weld these shackles on more firmly than ever. It undertook to defend and extend Catholic faith and authority, in their most pronounced forms, and to educate the world back into complete submission to them. In doing so, it had to set its face against freedom of thought, and, in certain directions at least, to freedom of inquiry, and this, naturally, involved the use of methods which brought upon it the suspicion and hatred of the outside world. To defend any notion, or system of notions, on any other basis than because it is true, and demonstrably so, is to undertake a task which can be accomplished only by hateful and tyrannical methods, and these will be bitterly resented by all rationally trained, self-respecting men, no matter how pious, well-meaning, gentle, and insinuating those who employ them may be. The unpopularity of the Jesuits is sufficiently explained when we say that they planted themselves square in the path of human progress toward freedom of thought and action.

The Society of Jesus was a great military organization, a Catholic "Salvation Army," with methods very much resembling those of its later imitator. In its plan of salvation was included, above all, education. Hence its camps, forts, and walled towns were grammar schools, colleges, and universities, which were manned according to the will of the "General" and his staff. Its officers were men who, having forsaken the world, and taken the monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, had received a careful military training for their duties, and

were ever ready to go where they were ordered, to aid in reconquering the world for Catholicism and supernaturalism. With excellent judgment, from their point of view, they refused to concern themselves with primary instruction, and even opposed the education of the working classes, confining themselves to the higher education of those—nobles and others—who were destined for the higher walks of life.

In drawing up their scheme of education, they showed great practical wisdom, and a keen sense of the demands of the time. These demands they tried to satisfy, and, at the same time to maintain intact the principles of authority and supernaturalism. Hence they vied with the Reformers in their devotion to logic and rhetoric, and with the Humanists of the Renaissance in their devotion to classical learning; but they did all this under the ægis of the strictly orthodox Dominican doctor, Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), whose philosophy * they made their standard, and in whose spirit they taught. In this way they were able to draw to their schools young men belonging to families of all persuasions, and to give them what they desired. Being unable, however, to use as a stimulus the natural delight that comes from the untrammelled investigation and discovery of truth, and, hence, to interest their pupils in study for its own sake, they were forced to employ all sorts of inferior and unnatural stimuli, both to attract and to retain them—emulation, titles, prizes, decorations, public exhibitions, dramatic representations, etc. Rhetoric, which enabled

* Under their influence, it was made the standard philosophy of the Catholic Church, by the papal encyclical, *Æterni Patris*, promulgated in 1879.

the young men to distinguish themselves in public, and to defend their acquired opinions in private, occupied a chief place in their system. Thus study was pursued, not for the sake of truth, but for the sake of distinction. In the matter of moral education, the aim of the Jesuits was to cultivate a blameless submissiveness, a cloistral virtue, through the enforcement of strict obedience, the removal of all occasions of sin, and the continual presentation of the glorious rewards and hideous punishments of the future life.* The cultivation of independent moral strength, implying, as it does, freedom of thought, they did not, and could not, attempt. Their ideal was the devoted Christian soldier, marching in strict, unquestioning obedience to orders held to be divine, and employing, with power and dexterity, all the weapons of the spirit for the conquest of an heretical world, that was tending to unbelief, rationalism, and insubordination. The aim, they held, justified the means.

In the early days of the Society of Jesus, when its religious enthusiasm was fresh, genuine, and chivalrous, it seems to have done excellent work in education. Both Bacon† (1561–1626) and Descartes (1596–1650) praise it highly. But after the rise of true protestant education, due, in large measure, to these very men, it seems to have sunk ever lower and lower. Leibniz (1646–1716) tells us that in education “the Jesuits have remained below mediocrity,” while Voltaire (1694–1778) declares that they taught him “nothing but Latin and nonsense.”‡ There is no reason to doubt that all these

* See Ignatius' *Exercitia Spiritualia*.

† See Hughes, *Loyola*, pp. 46, 92; cf. p. 105.

‡ See Compayré, *History of Pedagogy*, p. 141 (Eng. Trans.).

judgments are substantially correct. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries many distinguished men came forth from Jesuit institutions; but their number kept steadily diminishing in the eighteenth, till the dissolution of the society in 1754, by Pope Clement XIV.

The first Jesuit Colleges were founded in 1542, one at Coimbra in Portugal, another at Goa in India. After that they increased with extraordinary rapidity in various parts of the world. From almost the first, the schools were of three grades—(1) Grammar or Latin Schools, (2) Colleges or Lyceums, (3) General Studies or Universities. Of all these taken together there were, at the end of the seventeenth century, no fewer than 769, with perhaps 200,000 students. At the time of the suppression they had still 728. Indeed, for two hundred years the education of Christendom may be said to have been in their hands.

In the Constitution of the society, begun after over ten years of educational experience, Ignatius devoted considerable space to the matter of education and gave a clear outline of the plan to be pursued by his followers. Further regulations were made by his more immediate successors; but it was not until 1599, under the generalship of Aquaviva, that the famous *Ratio Studiorum* finally appeared. This has been the norm of all Jesuit education ever since. It underwent certain modifications in 1832; but these did not affect its spirit. It is both impossible and unnecessary to enter into the details of this here. Its general tendency has already been indicated.

While it is impossible for lovers of truth and freedom to have any sympathy with either the aim or the matter

of Jesuit education, there is one point connected with it that well deserves our most serious consideration, and that is its success. This was due to three causes, *first*, to the single-minded devotion of the members of the society; *second*, to their clear insight into the needs of their time; *third*, to the completeness with which they systematized their entire course, in view of a single well-defined aim. In all these matters, we can well afford to imitate them. Indeed, the education of the present day demands just the three conditions which they realized: *first*, a great, coherent society of teachers, utterly devoted to the work of education; *second*, a clear insight into the nature and scope of the education needed in our day; and, *third*, a completely graded system of instruction, worked out in view of the highest ideal of individual and social life. If the Jesuits can leave these three things as a bequest to the world, their existence will not have been in vain.

We have seen that the field of primary education was left unoccupied by the Jesuits. Several attempts to occupy it were made by others in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—by Father Calasanzio (died 1648), the founder of the Scuole Pie (Pious Schools), which in time became very numerous; by Father D mia who, in 1666, founded the Congregation of the Brethren of St. Charles, etc.; but no great advance was made until the advent of La Salle (1651–1719), the founder of the “Christian Schools,” which are still in a flourishing condition. La Salle was a saint of ascetic tendencies, and deeply interested in the poor. He strove to do for the lower classes what the Jesuits had done for the upper, and with the same purpose. His program consisted of “the

three R's," with spelling and catechism. He limited the use of corporal punishment, and laid great stress upon conduct; but he had no sense of the dignity of the child, or any desire that he should attain truth or moral freedom. He exalted authority, and did his best to cultivate submissiveness. The best that can be said of his work is that it was a great improvement upon anything existing in France before it.

Thus, neither the Reformation, nor the counter-Reformation took any decided step forward in education—any step toward science and freedom—and the latter even took a step backward. Both left education in the hands of the clergy; both retained the principle of authority, and looked to tradition, not to nature and experience, for truth. The same may be said of the Renaissance, in so far as it was merely a resuscitation of the literature and science of the Greek world. It merely substituted one authority for another, in many cases the authority of Plato for that of Aristotle. Nevertheless, it did pave the way for better things. By dividing the seat of authority, it helped to discredit and weaken authority itself; and by opening up the speculations of Greek science, it taught men to speculate on, and ultimately to investigate, the facts and processes of nature. When they did this, a new era began.

DIVISION III.

MODERN EDUCATION

CHAPTER I

THE FIFTEENTH, SIXTEENTH, AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

There are two ways of reaching knowledge, the one by reasoning, the other by experience. Reasoning concludes, and enables us to conclude an inquiry ; but it does not impart certainty or remove doubt, enabling the spirit to rest in the intuition of truth, unless it finds truth by way of experience.—ROGER BACON.

There are two kinds of experience. One comes through the external senses ; and in this way we experience, by instruments made for the purpose, the things which are in heaven and, by facts certified to vision, the things which are on earth ; while we know those things which do not occur in the places where we are through other wise men who have experienced them. This is human and philosophic experience. But this is not sufficient for man, because it does not impart complete certitude respecting things corporeal, by reason of their intrinsic difficulty, and is altogether barren in the case of things spiritual. The intellect, therefore, has to receive aid from another source ; for which reason the holy patriarchs and prophets, who first gave sciences to the world, received internal illuminations, and were not confined to the senses. And the same is true of many believers through Christ. For much illumination comes through the grace of faith, and through divine inspirations, not only in spiritual, but also in corporeal things, and in the sciences of philosophy.—Id.

He who, in disputing, cites an authority, makes use, not of his judgment, but of his memory.—LIONARDO DA VINCI.

If I cannot, like them, cite authorities, I shall appeal to something much higher and worthier, to experience, the mistress of their masters.—Id.

With regard to authority, Lionardo da Vinci pronounces himself with as much clearness as Bacon. He shows all the absurdity, illogicality, and immorality, in that superstitious religion of antiquity.—SÉAILLES, *Léonard de Vinci*, p. 187.

Give me for a few years the direction of education, and I will undertake to transform the world.—LEIBNIZ.

Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu.

The well educating of their children is so much the duty and concern of parents, and the welfare and prosperity of the nation so much depends on it, that I would have every one lay it seriously to heart; and, after having well examined and distinguished what fancy, custom, or reason advises in the case, set his helping hand to promote everywhere that way of training up youth, with regard to their several conditions, which is the easiest, shortest and likeliest to produce virtuous, useful, and able men, in their distinct callings; though that most to be taken care of is the gentleman's calling. For if those of that rank are by their education once set right, they will quickly bring all the rest into order.—LOCKE, *Some Thoughts concerning Education* (Epistle Dedicatory).

Modern education, which is correlated with modern science, dates from the time when men began to study nature, and to record their experience. The first man who, in modern times, attempted to do this was the Franciscan friar, Roger Bacon (1214–1294); but he, despite certain profound, and almost marvellous, insights, was still so deeply tinged with Mysticism and respect for authority that his efforts met with little or no response, and he spent many years of his life in prison, as a disturber of the faith.

The first man who really escaped from the fetters of authority and Mysticism, and committed himself fearlessly to experience, was Lionardo da Vinci (1452-1519), perhaps the greatest genius that Europe ever saw,* and one whom we are but now coming fully to appreciate. "Scholasticism does not exist for him. A happy ignorance sets him free, without his being aware of it. The separation of philosophy from theology is not even affirmed, it is assumed."† "With as little effort, and with the same ease, he avoids the dangers of humanism. . . . Lionardo da Vinci is a modern man, free from humanism as from scholasticism."‡ The world has never known a more acute, interested, and genial observer than he, or a man more capable of expressing, in the forms of literature and art, the result of his observations. He practised the method of science; but he did so without formulating it.

The latter task was left for a man of another race, for the Englishman, Francis Bacon (1561-1626), who, whatever his errors, intellectual and moral, may be called the father of modern science. Aristotle, in ancient times, had advocated and practised (even better than Bacon!) induction;§ in recent times, Bernardino Telesio (1508-1588) had insisted that all science must be based upon experience and induction; nevertheless, to Bacon belongs the credit of having secured currency and following for the experimental and inductive method of science,

* See Hallam, *Lit. Hist. of Europe*, Vol. I. p. 218. Séailles, *Léonard de Vinci, l'Artiste et le Savant*, Paris, 1892. Muntz, *La Vie et les Œuvres de Léonard de Vinci*. Paris, 1900.

† See Séailles, *ut sup.*, p. 185.

‡ Séailles, *Léonard de Vinci*, pp. 185 seq.

§ Bacon, like Luther and Ramus, was unjustly severe upon Aristotle, whom he did not understand. Like Luther and Knox, he showed a sad lack of scientific spirit in rejecting the Copernican astronomy.

as opposed to the authoritative and deductive. With him "book-science, which suppresses intelligence, on pretence of cultivating it,"* came to an end, and was slowly replaced by the direct study of nature. Two great discoveries, that of the Copernican astronomy, and that of America, both contributing to break up that view of the universe which lay at the basis of mediæval science, helped to facilitate this change. From now on, we find a tendency to withdraw education from authority and the hands of the clergy, and to commit it to science and the hands of laymen.

Bacon himself did little directly for the cause of education; but his works proved an inspiration to men who did much. Prominent among these was the man who has been called the "Bacon of modern education,"† and may justly be called its father—John Amos Comenius.‡ There is no better testimony to the value of Bacon's method than the fact that, under its impulse, this man leapt, almost at one bound, from the repressive education of the Middle Age to the freedom-giving education of our own times. It may be truly said that all modern education has been built up upon the foundation which he laid. He saw and emphasized the need

* Séailles, *Léonard de Vinci*, p. 188.

† Compayré, *Hist. of Pedagogy*, p. 122 (Eng. Trans.).

‡ Properly Komensky, born at Nivnitz, Moravia, 1592; lost his parents early; studied at Strassnick, Herborn (Nassau), Amsterdam, Heidelberg. Made head of Moravian Brethren's school at Fulneck, 1618, when he was ordained and married; driven out by persecution 1627; is called to superintend the education of several countries—Sweden, England, etc.; works at Elbrog in Prussia, 1641-48; goes to Lissa in Poland, and becomes senior bishop of the Moravians; in Transylvania, 1650-54; in that year returns to Lissa, which is burnt by the Poles; loses all his property, and has to retire to Amsterdam, to his patron De Geer. Spends a quiet old age, and publishes a complete edition of his pedagogical works; dies 1671. See Art. *Comenius* in "Universal Encyclopædia"; Laurie, *Life of Comenius*; Quick, *Educational Reformers*.

of universal education, as the essential condition of universal freedom, and, through good and evil report, devoted himself to the instruction of the lower classes. The Jesuits had done something toward the systematization of the higher studies; but Comenius was the first who arranged a course of instruction extending from infancy to manhood—a course including four grades, or schools, (1) the home-school (Kindergarten!), (2) the primary, elementary, common, or district school, (3) the grammar or Latin school (gymnasium), (4) the academy, college, or university. The first, he held, should be found in every family; the second, in every village, parish or district; the third, in every city or township; the fourth in every kingdom, province, or state.* The course in each institution was to extend over six years, so that the pupil who took the whole should finish at the age of twenty-four. In one respect, each school was preparatory to all that followed it; in another, it was complete in itself, representing a certain grade of general education, corresponding to a certain grade of vocation. The first two grades were to be traversed by every child, male or female; and the instruction in them was to be given in the common language—hence the term, “common” schools. The two higher grades were to be taken by *boys* intending to pursue the higher professions, and in these he was still willing that Latin should be employed.

With true pedagogic instinct, Comenius recognized that children’s faculties should be drawn out in their natural order—perception, memory, imagination, reason†—and through things and facts rather than through

* Cf. the Chinese system, pp. 41 sqq.

† Cf. Preyer, *Die Seele des Kindes*, and Baldwin, *Mental Development in the Child and in the Race*.

books, the function of the latter being to supplement the experience of the individual by that of the race. He saw that the latter can be interpreted only in terms of the former, and that where there is little individual experience, the race experience recorded in books can be but poorly interpreted. He insisted that education begins at birth, and that very young children may, in the home, acquire the first elements of physics (dynamics, optics, acoustics), natural history (botany, zoology, etc.), history, geography, chronology, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, grammar, and even of logic, metaphysics, ethics and politics. With all this, he did not neglect physical exercise and manual training. He fully recognized the intellectual and moral value of productive activity. He insisted that schools should be built in healthy situations, and have plenty of free space about them. In the primary schools the home studies were to be carried further, others were to be added, and a rounded education, fitting for the ordinary walks of life, was to be imparted. In the higher institutions, foreign languages and the whole circle of the sciences were to be studied. The former were to be learnt by the natural method, grammar coming in merely as a corrective of use; the latter by observation, experiment, and generalization. Comenius does not seem to have distinguished very clearly between culture, erudition, and professional training; and nothing better shows our dependence on him than the fact that in America they are not clearly distinguished to this day. Comenius, like Bacon, paid his tribute to the Middle Age, in adhering to the belief that science could be eked out with a sort of mystic vision and thaumaturgic activity, in such a way that man might finally come to

have complete control over nature, as well as complete knowledge.* Of the many books which he wrote, the large majority show this mystic, theosophic tendency, his educational system being propounded, mainly, in three works—(1) *Didactica Magna* (Czech and Latin), (2) *Janua Linguarum Reserata*, (3) *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*. The third is mainly the second, illustrated.

With Comenius, the cause of truth and freedom in education was virtually won. Authority and tyranny had yielded to truth and sympathy. It was long, indeed, before the fruits of his victory were gathered. Protestantism, after its first enthusiasm of negation was over, more and more belied its own first principle, and bowed down before authority. The schools still remained almost exclusively in the hands of the clergy. Comenius was almost forgotten till the present century. In spite of this, his influence never died out, but continued to inspire the later reformers of education. Locke, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Fröbel, some of whom seem never to have heard of him, are, nevertheless, his pupils and continuators. Comenius is, emphatically, one of the Great Educators.

The movement away from authority and toward freedom, which found expression in the experimental science of Bacon and the pedagogy of Comenius, made itself felt in all the departments of human life, especially in religion and politics. In religion, it produced the Reformation; in politics, that persistent tendency to ignore the divine right of kings, and to place the seat of authority in the people, which, beginning about 1600, has ever since been growing. English Puritanism and the Scotch

* Like Prospero, in Shakespeare's *Tempest*.

Covenant were essentially democratic, though theocratic. They accepted God as ruler, indeed, but denied that he had any special vicegerent on earth. They used theocracy to shake off monarchy, and then dropped theocracy. The same thing took place among the Dutch. All this found practical expression in the two English revolutions (1649, 1688), and in the settlement of New England, which meant so many victories for freedom.

But it was a considerable time before the movement became sufficiently conscious of its own meaning and presuppositions to give them conscious expression in a philosophy; and until this is done, no movement can display its whole strength or proceed securely. The Reformation, indeed, was so little aware of its own implications, that it remained for nearly a century and a half without a philosophy. At last, however, it formed this also, thanks to René Descartes (1596–1650) and John Locke (1632–1704). Widely different as these two men were, in race, education, and character, they agreed in looking for the guarantee of all truth in some form of experience, thus virtually placing the seat of all authority in the human breast—the very essence of Protestantism! The universal doubt, which Descartes cherished with regard to all external criteria of truth, he removed by reference to internal consciousness. “I think, therefore I am”—thought and being are one.* Locke practically said “Feeling and being are one.”† Neither clearly saw all the implications of his own principle; but they came out later. All subsequent philosophy is built upon their foundations. Descartes, with

* Cf. Parmenides, *Tò γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι.*

† His follower, Cabanis (1757–1808), said “Vivre c'est sentir.”

his Jesuit education, allowed himself to be drawn back into a new dogmatism, and so undid much of his own good work. He managed to pass from his own being to that of God, and then, on the basis of God's assumed truthfulness, to believe in the reality of the world—a distinct return to faith and authority. But he did most excellent service (1) in separating the world of thought from the world of extension,* and thereby banishing metaphysical entities—angels, intelligences, etc.—from the explanation of the phenomenal universe; and (2) also (by the resuscitation of the atomic doctrine of Democritus) in introducing mathematics into chemistry. Locke, with his sober protestant education, was less ambitious for absolute truth, being content to remain within the limits of experience. Descartes' philosophy naturally worked itself out into the pantheistic mysticism of Spinoza and the formal, metaphysical dogmatism of Wolf—barren enough results, both of them. That of Locke, after passing through the hands of Berkeley and Hume, woke Kant from his “dogmatic slumber,” and made further progress possible. Thus, Locke may be said to be the father of modern thought, which rests on experience.

Both Descartes and Locke contributed to the cause of education, the former indirectly, the latter directly. Animated by the modern spirit, and distrustful of the literary, backward-looking education of the Jesuits, Descartes demanded that the mind should be trained to think, and to deal with facts, not merely with words and authorities. He deprecated the prolonged study of the classical languages. In the first section of his earliest work, the *Discourse on Method*, he gives many valuable

* In doing this, he was, of course, entirely wrong; but his error did good service for a time.

hints as to the mode of imparting information. He lays down the following rules for himself: (1) never to accept as true what is not recognized as such so clearly and distinctly as to leave no room for doubt; (2) to break up every difficult problem, as far as possible, into its parts; (3) to think in an orderly manner, proceeding from the simpler and easier, step by step, to the more complex and difficult, even in cases where a special order is not prescribed by the nature of the subject, but is adopted for the sake of ordered progress in investigation; (4) by completeness of enumeration, and universality of survey, to make sure that nothing is overlooked.

Locke's * direct contribution to education is contained in his little work, *Some Thoughts concerning Education* (1693), based partly on actual experience in teaching, and partly on current prejudices. It is not a treatise on education generally, but on how to "breed" an English gentleman of a somewhat formal and philistine sort. Its motto is "A sound mind in a sound body." Beginning with the latter, it lays down rules for exercise and hygiene, which are summed up thus: "Plenty of open air, exercise and sleep; plain diet, no wine or strong drink, and very little or no physic; not too warm and strait clothing; especially the head and feet kept cold, and the feet often used to cold water and exposed to wet." †

* John Locke, born at Wrington, near Bristol (1632); studied at Westminster school, then at Oxford (1651 sqq.); gave attention to natural science, and the works of William of Occam and Descartes; accompanied Sir Walter Vane to the court of Brandenburg (1665); became physician and friend in the house of Lord Ashley, later Earl of Shaftesbury (1667); travelled with the Earl of Northumberland in France and Italy (1668); received a government office (1672); lived in southern France (1675-1679); in England (1679-1683); with the Earl of Pembroke in Holland (1683-1688); published *Essay on the Human Understanding* (1690); spent his last years in the house of Sir Francis Masham; died there, at the age of 73, in 1704.

† § 30.

Passing on to the mind, it recommends for it a like hardening process. "As the strength of the body lies chiefly in being able to endure hardships, so also does that of the mind. And the great principle and foundation of all virtue and worth is placed in this, that a man is able to deny himself his own desires, cross his own inclinations, and purely follow what reason directs as best, though the appetite lean the other way." * With a view to this, discipline must be begun early, and parental authority be firmly established. Punishments should be as light as possible; flogging and beating should be used only in the extreme case of conscious obstinacy; but then they should be continued until the child completely yields. Rewards and decorations are discouraged, the proper motives to moral conduct being love of reputation, and praise and fear of the opposite—questionable enough motives, surely! Children should be allowed to be gamesome, and burdened with few rules, example being more powerful than precept. "Everyone's natural genius should be carried as far as it could; but to attempt the putting another upon him, will be but labor in vain; and what is so plastered on will at best sit but untowardly, and have always hanging to it the ungracefulness of constraint and affectation." † Children should not be troubled greatly with mere formal manners, which should be imparted rather by example than by rule. The important thing is to cultivate the right disposition, and then leave it to find its natural expression. "Never trouble yourself about those faults in them which you know age will cure." ‡ Children should have all possible liberty, and yet should be carefully shielded from bad company, ser-

* § 33.

† § 48.

‡ § 50.

vants, bad boys, etc. Hence it is better that they should be instructed at home by a tutor than sent away to school among rude boys. "None of the things they are to learn should ever be made a burden to them, or imposed upon them as a task." * Learning should be like play.† Children love freedom, and, hence, should not be subjected to compulsion, or forced to do things when they are disinclined. They should be reasoned with and not scolded. A knowledge of the world, of men, and of their foibles is better than a knowledge of books. Hence, the tutor should be a gentleman, and a man of the world, rather than a scholar. "For who expects that under a tutor a young gentleman should be an accomplished critic, orator, or logician, go to the bottom of metaphysics, philosophy, or mathematics; or be a master in history or chronology? though something of each of these is to be taught him. . . . But of good breeding, knowledge of the world, virtue, industry, and a love of reputation, he cannot have too much. And, if he have these, he will not long want what he needs or desires of the other." ‡ Parents should make every effort to gain and keep the confidence of their children, and to prove their best friends, at the same time sternly putting down obstinacy, lying, ill-nature, and love of dominion. Every effort should be made to satisfy children's curiosity, and to make them vain of their acquirements. || They should be taught to be deferential to each other, and to be just and generous. The generous child should not be al-

* § 73.

† Aristotle said, more wisely: "Education ought certainly not to be turned into a means of amusement; for young people are not playing when they are learning, since all learning is accompanied with pain."

‡ § 94.

|| §§ 108, 109.

lowed to be the loser by his generosity. "Let all the instances he gives of such freeness be always repaid, and with interest, and let him sensibly perceive that the kindness he shows to others is no ill husbandry for himself."* Crying should not be permitted, and, while foolhardiness should be tamed, every effort should be made to cultivate courage and hardiness. Undesirable tastes should be cured by surfeiting, rather than by curbing. Games and play should be encouraged; but very few playthings should be given, except those which the children themselves manufacture. When children do wrong and confess, they should be pardoned and commended.

The aims of education are Virtue, Wisdom, Breeding, Learning. The foundation of Virtue is "a true notion of God, as of the independent Supreme Being, Author and Maker of all things, from whom we receive all good, who loves us and gives us all things," † coupled with a love of truth. "Wisdom I take, in the popular acceptance, for a man's managing his business ably, and with foresight, in this world." ‡ The fundamental principle of Good Breeding is "Not to think meanly of ourselves, and not to think meanly of others." || Among the aims of education, Learning is last in importance. "Children may be cozened into a knowledge of the letters; be taught to read without perceiving it to be anything but a sport, and play themselves into what others are whipped for. Children should not have anything like work, or serious, laid on them." ¶ "Cheer him [the child] into it [reading] if you can; but make it not a business for him." ** When he can read, he should take up *Æsop's Fables* (with pictures), the *Paternoster*, *Creed*, and

Decalogue. The Bible, as a whole, is not a good textbook; but parts of it may be so used. After reading, come writing and drawing. Even shorthand may be acquired. Then come languages, of which the most important are French and Latin, both of which ought to be learnt in the natural way, by conversation. English ought not to be neglected. "Latin I look upon as absolutely necessary to a gentleman," * says Locke, and to a gentleman alone. Grammar should be taught only to those who desire a critical knowledge of a language, or who have officially to write in it. Along with languages should be learnt the sciences—geography, astronomy, arithmetic, chronology, anatomy, history, geometry, botany, geology, etc. These are better than abstract logic and metaphysics. Latin themes, declamations, and verses are forbidden, and any tendency toward poetry ought to be sternly repressed. "It is to me the strangest thing in the world, that the father should desire or suffer it to be cherished or improved. Methinks the parents should labor to have it stifled and suppressed as much as may be; . . . for it is very seldom seen that anyone discovers mines of gold or silver in Parnassus. It is a pleasant air, but a barren soil; and there are very few instances of those who have added to their patrimony by anything they have reaped from thence. Poetry and gaming, which usually go together, are alike in this too, that they seldom bring any advantage but to those that have nothing else to live on. Men of estates almost constantly go away losers." † Ethics should be studied in the Bible and in "Tully's *Offices*" (Cicero, *De Officiis*); Civil Law, which in connection with history, is most useful, in Puffendorf

* § 164.

† § 174.

and Grotius. "A virtuous, well-behaved young man that is well versed in the general part of the civil law . . . understands Latin well, and can write a good hand, one may turn loose into the world, with great assurance that he will find employment and esteem everywhere." *

Though grammar, rhetoric, and logic are held of small account, yet "there can be no greater defect in a gentleman than not to express himself well, either in writing or speaking." † Especial attention should be paid to letter-writing in English. "Natural philosophy, as a speculative science, I imagine, we have none, and perhaps I may think I have reason to say, we shall never be able to make a science of it. The works of nature are contrived by a wisdom, and operate by ways, too far surpassing our faculties to discover, or capacities to conceive, for us ever to be able to reduce them into a science. Natural philosophy being the knowledge of principles, properties, and operations of things as they are in themselves, I imagine there are two parts of it, one comprehending spirits, with their nature and qualities, and the other bodies. The first of these is usually referred to metaphysics; but under what title soever the consideration of spirits comes, I think it ought to go before the study of matter and body, not as a science that can be methodized into a system, and treated of, upon principles of knowledge; but as an enlargement of our minds towards a truer and fuller comprehension of the intellectual world, to which we are led both by reason and revelation. And since the clearest and largest discoveries we have of other spirits, besides God and our own souls,

* § 186.

† § 189.

are imparted to us from heaven by revelation, I think the information, that at least young people should have of them, should be taken from revelation. To this end, I conclude, it would be well, if there were made a good history of the Bible for young people to read . . . that by reading of it constantly, there would be instilled into the minds of children a notion and belief of spirits, they having so much to do, in all the transactions of that history, which will be a good preparation for the study of bodies. For, without the notion and allowance of spirit, our philosophy will be lame and defective in one main part of it, when it leaves out the contemplation of the most excellent and powerful part of the creation." * . . . "The reason why I would have this premised to the study of bodies, and the doctrine of the Scriptures well imbibed, before young men be entered in natural philosophy, is, because matter being a thing that all our senses are constantly conversant with, it is so apt to possess the mind, and exclude all other beings but matter, that prejudice, grounded on such principles, often leaves no room for the admittance of spirits, or the allowing of any such things as immaterial beings, 'in rerum natura'; when yet it is evident, that by mere matter and motion, none of the great phenomena of nature can be resolved; to instance but in that common one of gravity, which I think impossible to be explained by any natural operation of matter, or any other law of motion, but the positive will of a superior Being so ordering it." † Despite this, it is well for "gentlemen" to know something of natural philosophy. "Such writings . . . as many of Mr. Boyle's are, with others

* § 190. Some of this is directed against Descartes.

† § 192.

that have writ of husbandry, planting, gardening, and the like, may be fit for a gentleman, when he has a little acquainted himself with some of the systems of natural philosophy in fashion.”* The works of “the incomparable Mr. Newton” are especially deserving of study.

Greek, like all languages, is valuable, but should not be studied until men have reached maturity. Dancing (not jigs!) should be learnt early; and fencing and riding, though dangerous, are desirable; but music is of small account. “It wastes so much of a young man’s time to gain but a moderate skill in it, and engages often in such odd company, that many think it much better spared: and I have, amongst men of parts and business, so seldom heard anyone commended or esteemed for having an excellency in music, that amongst all those things that ever came into the list of accomplishments, I think I may give it the last place.”†

With regard to recreation Locke has some fresh views. Being no great friend of unproductive amusements, and a distinct enemy of gambling (cards and dice), he advises every gentleman desiring serious recreation to learn a trade or craft. Painting would be good; but it is too sedentary. Better are gardening, husbandry, and carpentry, and there is no objection to “perfuming, varnishing, graining, and several sorts of working in iron, brass and silver; and if, as it happens to most young gentlemen, that a considerable part of his time be spent in a great town, he may learn to cut, polish, and set precious stones, or employ himself in grinding and polishing optical glasses.”‡ Bookkeeping should be learnt by every

* § 193.

† § 197.

‡ § 209.

gentleman, in order that he may look after his own accounts. Foreign travel is recommended, but not at the age (from sixteen to twenty-one) at which it is usually undertaken. It should come either earlier or later, not at the most critical period in a young man's life.

Such is a brief summary of Locke's rather unsystematic work on the breeding of an English gentleman. Like everything that Locke wrote, it is marked by prosaic common sense and contented worldliness. He has little interest in art, science, or philosophy, or in what they may do for a man. He aims at discipline, not instruction. He would impart as much instruction in accepted truth as is necessary for good breeding; but he would make no effort to rouse original thought or induce young men to strike out new paths for themselves. He has no sense of true morality, or of the "glorious freedom" that goes with it. His ethical motive, "love of praise and commendation," which he says "should be instilled by all arts imaginable,"* is essentially immoral, and could produce nothing but vain prigs and conceited philistines. He makes no effort to arouse a sense of duty, or to use it as a spring of action. He would deliver men from slavery to passion by making them slaves to their social environment. He has no conception of the methods and aims of physical science, and would still have us look for an explanation of the world to "spirits," best known to us through revelation. Thus science is still the handmaid of theology, and the door is left wide open for all kinds of superstition—possession, witchcraft, etc. He is what would to-day be called an "agnostic," endeavoring to hide his agnosticism under

* § 201.

superstition.* In the higher regions of thought, his point of view does not essentially differ from that of the Jesuits. In education he replaces the authority of God by the authority of polite society, the clergy by the landed gentry. The unsatisfactoriness of his philosophy will become clear when it passes into the hands of Berkeley and Hume; that of his educational system, when it comes to be interpreted by Rousseau. Locke was the father of modern scepticism, and its correlate, modern anarchism, best expressed in the French Revolution. Through these the world had to pass, before it reached the ground of science and of free government.

Apart from the contributions of Descartes and Locke, the seventeenth century did little for education. Other interests, social and religious, were more absorbing. The efforts of Fénélon, with his work on the *Education of Girls*, of Madame de Sévigné, Madame de Maintenon, Rollin and others, did something to humanize education; but they all left the old foundation untouched, and rose to no new principle. The work of the Brothers of the Christian Schools has already been referred to.

* He thinks that Noah's flood may have been due to God's altering the position of the earth's centre of gravity.

CHAPTER II.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The Englishman of the eighteenth century was greatly addicted to agriculture as a business or a pleasure, or both. It was the "reigning task" of the age.—THOROLD ROGERS, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, p. 469.

Thou hast destroyed it,
The beautiful world,
With mighty fist.
It sinks, it sunders.
A demigod hath shivered it.
We carry
The ruins over into naught,
And wail over the lost beauty.
Mighty one

Of the sons of earth,
More gloriously
Build it again,
In the bosom build it up !
New life-career
Begin,
With clear sense,
And let new songs
Ring over it.

—GÖTHE, *Faust*, Pt. I.

It is worth while to know Social Philosophy, because, until we know that, we do not know what else it is worth while to know.—MACKENZIE, *Social Philosophy*.

When the seventeenth century closed, the Reformation and the Renaissance, the discovery of the Copernican astronomy and of America, the philosophies of Bacon, Hobbes, Descartes and Locke, and the English revolutions of 1649 and 1688 had separated mediæval from modern times by a gulf which even imagination could hardly bridge. In all the spheres of life, authority was giving place to truth and to the freedom that comes of truth. The spirit of national and sectarian exclusive-

ness was giving way to the spirit of humanity and free inquiry. Education was showing the effect of all this. It was slowly extending to all classes of society, and passing from the hands of the clergy to the those of the laity. The use of Latin was being replaced by that of living languages. The study of nature and of modern culture was receiving more and more attention. Men were being taught to live in the present and not in the past. With all this, however, the spirit that stirred in the great movements of the two preceding centuries had not yet received complete expression. The Reformation and the Renaissance had belied their own principles and found a place, beside truth and nature, for authority and supernature. The philosophies which were meant to give expression to the new spirit made truces with theosophy and intolerance. Even the judicious, large-minded Locke refused freedom of thought to atheists, while Descartes was too timid to accept the Copernican astronomy. The English revolutions still left England with kings "by the grace of God."

For all that, the forward movement was not checked, and the attempt to check it only brought revolution and destruction. The Reformation and the Renaissance found almost complete expression, respectively, in Voltaire and Rousseau; the philosophy of Locke in the absolute scepticism of Hume, which left not one stone upon another of the whole mediæval world of things or thought; the English revolutionary spirit, in the American and French revolutions. In all these expressions the uncertain purpose and vacillating methods of the movement became clearly apparent. It had not yet learnt its own meaning.

In the first half of the eighteenth century, no marked advance in education took place. It was a time of ominous calm, foreboding a storm. This calm was rudely broken in 1750, by the appearance of Rousseau* in the field of literature, with a bitter polemic against civilization and the demand that men should return to a "state of nature." Being himself a sensuous, indolent, and undisciplined creature, impatient of all moral restraint, he set out to construct a world which should justify his own existence and allow him to flatter himself, as he did, that he was one of the best of men. This is the true source of all his political and educational theories, and the secret of their wide influence. In the middle of last century, the repressive supernatural education of the Jesuits and Calvinists, which had not kept pace with advancing thought toward Reason and Nature, produced, in favor of freedom, a strong reaction, which, in its early stages, was, naturally, exaggerated and reckless. At last,

* Jean-Jacques Rousseau, born at Geneva (1712); loses his mother at his birth; is kept at home and reads a whole library of sentimental novels before the age of seven; goes to school at Boissey (1720); apprenticed to a notary, then to an engraver (1723); runs away, becomes a Catholic, and is sent to Turin for religious instruction (1726); returns to Chambéry (1729), and resides with the frivolous Madame de Warens; is deserted by her for a time, returns to her (1732) and remains till 1741, reading science and philosophy in a desultory way, goes to Paris (1741), tries his fortune as a composer; takes Thérèse Levasseur to live with him (1744); sends his children to the foundling asylum; writes his essay on the moral effect of the Arts and Sciences (1750); that on *Inequality among Men* (1753); returns to Geneva and protestantism (1754); settles at the Hermitage near Montmorency (1756); leaves this and takes a cottage near by; writes the *New Héloïse* (1759), the *Social Contract* and *Emile* (1762); is bitterly persecuted, and flees to Switzerland (1762); thence with David Hume to England (1766); returns to France (1767); wanders about with Thérèse for three years; settles down in Paris in humble fashion (1770); becomes morbid and unhappy; writes *Dialogues* and *Rêveries*; goes to recruit at Ermenonville (May 1778); dies July 2d of the same year; his body removed to the Panthéon in Paris, October 11, 1793. See my *Rousseau and Education according to Nature*, in the "Great Educator" series (Scribner's 1898).

Nature found a voice in Rousseau, as Reason did in Voltaire. Both were opposed to Revelation.

Man, in his upward progress, emancipated himself from slavery to nature, by submitting himself to human institutions; and he bids fair, by making these the expression of his own social nature, to emancipate himself from them also, and thus be entirely free. Rousseau, not seeing this, and not recognizing bondage to nature as slavery at all, called upon men to throw aside institutions, as having only a corrupting, distorting influence, and return to the state of the unsocial savage. This is the burden of his three political essays, especially of the *Social Contract*, which opens with "Man is born free, and is everywhere in chains." His educational writings, of which the chief is *Emile*, are meant to furnish the program of unsocial education, of which he found an embodiment in Robinson Crusoe.* He draws a good deal of his material from Montaigne and Locke, especially from the latter, whose positions frequently show their essential weakness in his hands. The principles by means of which Locke meant to maintain a stable society, and to educate men for it, Rousseau turned into instruments for the subversion of all society and the education of men for the life of savages. Utterly despising Locke's ethical sanction, the approval of society, he was left with no sanction at all but the brute necessity of nature; and, indeed, this was the only one to which he appealed. Nature, which, as usually understood, is but another name for necessity,† plays a most important and funda-

* He does not seem to have known Ibn Tufail's *Hayy ibn Yokdhan* (twelfth century), long such a favorite with the Quakers, and much more to his purpose.

† It was the notion of necessity (ἀνάγκη, μοιρα, αἴσα, etc.) that developed into that of nature (φύσις) in Greece.

mental part in education, and Rousseau does excellent work, so long as he champions it in its own sphere; but he is most pernicious, when he claims the whole of education for it. When he follows Locke, in demanding for children freedom, exercise, fresh air, etc., we can completely sympathize with him; but, when he makes Locke's demand that children should be placed under a tutor at home, instead of being sent to school, mean that they should be separated from family and society, and placed, singly, in the hands of a tutor who on all occasions behaves like a part of brute nature, he is dehumanizing them, and making impossible the growth of any social or moral consciousness. Locke, while highly recommending moral discipline, as the indispensable condition of all education, had most unwisely said that no tasks should be imposed upon children, and that they were to be "cozened," or "cheated" into learning even to read. Rousseau extends this so as to make the whole of education a cheat. His *Emile* is to be cheated and duped at every step, and it is the poorest compliment to his education that this is possible. The motives by which he is led are all of the selfish, unsocial sort, and, indeed, are nearly always sensual. Sensual enjoyment, Rousseau claims to be true living. "What," he says, "are we to think of that barbarous education which sacrifices the present to an uncertain future, which loads the child with all sorts of chains, and begins by rendering it miserable, in order to prepare it for some distant, pretended happiness, which it will probably never enjoy? . . . Who knows how many children perish, victims of the extravagant wisdom of a father or a teacher? . . . Fathers, do you know the moment when death awaits

your children? . . . As soon as they are able to feel the pleasure of being, see that they enjoy it; take care that . . . they do not die without having tasted life. . . . Miserable foresight, which renders a being unhappy in the present, in the ill-founded hope of making him happy in the future. . . . Everything is folly and contradiction in human institutions. . . . Foresight! foresight, which continually carries us beyond ourselves, and often places us where we shall never really arrive, is the true source of all our miseries. What folly for an ephemeral being, like man, to be looking forever into a distant future, which rarely comes, and to neglect the present, of which he is sure! . . . The only man who does his will is he who, in order to do so, has no need to eke out his own arms with those of another; whence it follows that *the first of all blessings is not authority, but liberty*. This is my fundamental maxim. We have but to apply it to childhood, and all the rules of education will flow from it.” *

The writer may, perhaps, be allowed to quote here a passage from his own *Rousseau*, commenting on these sentiments: “The end of life is happiness, and happiness is the sensual enjoyment of each moment as it passes; without thought, plan, or aspiration for higher things, nay, without regard to others. All efforts after a divine life of deep insight, strong, just affection, and far-reaching beneficent will, all unions among men for the realization of this life, in and through society, are folly and contradiction. To live as the beast lives, in his appointed place, is the chief end of man. Because some children die before they reach youth or manhood, it is cruel to

* *Emile*, Bk. II.

deprive any, through discipline, self-denying continuous tasks, or thought of the future, of the manifold, thoughtless delights of the present. Discipline and self-control have no value in themselves; at best they are but means for future pleasure. The child that dies without having enjoyed pleasure has not 'tasted of life.' No matter what his spiritual attainments, or the beauty and nobility of his character, his existence has been a failure. Whatever interferes with present pleasure is evil.

"It would hardly be possible to form a more pitiful conception of human life and education than this. There is not a moral or noble trait in it. The truth is, Rousseau was so purely a creature of sense and undisciplined impulse that he never, for one moment, rose to a consciousness of moral life at all." *

Indeed, he thought moral life an egregious blunder. Speaking of his *Emile*, he says: "Devoid of all morality in his actions, he can do nothing that is morally evil, or that deserves chastisement or reprimand." He had small respect even for intellectual life. "Exercise," he says, "the child's body, his organs, his senses, his strength; but keep his mind indolent as long as possible. . . . Look upon all delays as advantages . . . let childhood ripen in children. . . . If a lesson has to be given, do not give it to-day, if it can be put off till to-morrow."

It would be unprofitable to follow *Emile* through the further stages of his anti-social education. It is all of a piece, aiming to produce a docile animal. Indeed, it is just such an education as a high-bred dog might receive. He, of course, learns a trade, because he thus comes to be able to use his hands, and so to be inde-

* Davidson, *Rousseau*, pp. 118 seq.

pendent of society; but he avoids all intellectual and social culture. "Reading is the curse of childhood," and "since our errors come from our judgments, it is clear that, if we never had to judge, we should never have to learn, and never be liable to deceive ourselves. We should be happier in our ignorance than we can be in our knowledge."

In course of time, Emile is ready to take a wife; and a suitable one, thanks to that good genius, the tutor, is ready for him. This gives Rousseau an opportunity of stating his views on the education of girls. And they are such as we might expect. "Woman is made to please man. . . . Thus all the education of women must have relation to men. To please them, to be useful to them, to rear them when they are young, to tend them when they are grown, to make their lives pleasant and sweet—these are the duties of women in all times, and what they ought to learn from earliest childhood. . . . Woman is a coquette by profession. . . . Girls must be wide-awake and laborious; more than that, they must be early subjected to repression. . . . From the first they must be exercised in constraint, so that it may never cost them anything; and taught to overcome all their fancies, in order to subject them to the will of others. . . . From this habitual constraint there results a docility, which women have need of all their lives, since they never cease to be subjected either to a man or to the judgments of men, without ever being allowed to set themselves above these judgments. The first and most important attribute of a woman is sweetness. Being made to obey an imperfect being like man, often so full of vices, and always so full of faults, she must early learn

to submit even to injustice, and to bear the misdeeds of a husband without complaining. . . . She must never scold. . . . While a man speaks what he knows, a woman speaks what pleases. . . . We ought not, therefore, to stop the chatter of girls. . . . They must make it a rule never to say anything but what is agreeable to those with whom they talk." And so on for many pages.

Emile, of course, falls violently in love with Sophie, and, in due time, is engaged to her. Then this young man, who has been reared as a mere sensuous animal, is called upon to behave, all at once, like a Stoic. Before marrying, he is commanded by his inexorable tutor to thwart nature completely, to leave Sophie, and travel for two years, in order to see the world, and find a fit place to settle down in. The parting scene shows that Rousseau had no sense of the ludicrous. Emile, in course of time, returns, charged with Stoic independence, marries Sophie, and is blest with a son. On the birth of the latter, Emile says to his tutor: "Remain the master of the young masters. Advise us, govern us: we will be docile. As long as I live, I shall need you. I have more need of you than ever, now that my functions as a man are beginning." It would hardly be possible to pass a severer judgment than this upon Emile's education. Though a husband and father, he has no power to guide himself, but is completely dependent upon another. Nor could this be otherwise, since, though duped into believing that he has always been guiding himself, he has, in reality, been a mere puppet in his tutor's hands.

After a time, the tutor leaves his wards, and then all sorts of mischief happen. The poor creatures, who have

been living in the quiet retirement of the country, are induced to go to live in a city, to mingle with men. Here Emile acquires frivolous tastes, and Sophie falls from virtue, which is just what might be expected from such inexperienced people. After various vicissitudes, Emile finds his way to a lonely island (Robinson Crusoe's?), where, to his surprise, he finds Sophie officiating as a priestess. After explanations, a reconciliation takes place, and the two, having seen enough of society, and proved for themselves its degrading influence, remain on their island, as "solitaries," and—are happy ever after!

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to pass any judgment on a scheme of education of which this is the outcome. It judges itself. Indeed, it would hardly have justified the attention here given to it, were it not for the sensation which its glittering paradoxes and sentimental appeals caused, and unhappily, still cause, in the world. Rousseau took no step forward in education. What is true in his scheme is due, mostly, to Locke; what is his own is false and misleading. Though pretending to have great sympathy with the lower classes, he is opposed to their being educated. "Ignorance is bliss." The sober truth is, he understood almost nothing either of the methods or of the aims of education, and it was only his insidious, dogmatic, and sentimental style that made him popular with people who knew as little as he did. His anarchic, unsocial individualism and his demand for immediate, sensual pleasure co-operated with Voltaire's all-dissolving intellectual scepticism in bringing about the French Revolution, and in imparting to it those characteristics which rendered it so ineffective for good. Voltaire broke the old theological social bonds; Rousseau

forbade man to look for new ones in reason.* The result could hardly have been other than it was, a furious revolution, followed by a blind reaction. If France is to-day rent by the opposing claims of theological authority and sensual anarchism, we know the reason why.

The sun of the eighteenth century set in blood, because old moral sanctions had failed, and new ones had not been found. Before such could be found; before education and civilization could advance to higher ground, a new philosophy, furnishing a true interpretation of the growing movement toward truth and freedom, a new view of the world and man's relation to it, had to arise. And it did arise, or rather it had arisen (too late to be of service in the great cataclysm) in the mind of the half-Scotch, half-German Immanuel Kant,† with whom a new era in the world's spiritual history begins.

* As Socrates did, [in similar circumstances. France found no Socrates.

† Born at Königsberg, 1724, and lived there, as student, private tutor, librarian, and professor, his entire life. His epoch-making work, the *Critique of Pure Reason*, appeared in 1781. He died in 1804.

CHAPTER III.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Two things move me to ever greater awe ; the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me. Duty ! Word so sublime and full of meaning, whence art thou, and what origin is worthy of thee? Thou dost not appeal to us through the persuasiveness of passion ; nor by threats dost thou seek to stir our wills. Thou wouldst not have us shrink from thee in fear and terror. But thou settest up a law which is of our own souls ; to this law thou exactest unconditional submission. Before the law we bow in awe, even though not always in obedience ; all feelings retire before it in silence, even though they may seek to evade its decrees.—KANT.

The understanding creates the world.—KANT.

Man is man and master of his fate.—TENNYSON.

The antithesis . . . between the self and the world is not a valid antithesis psychologically considered. The self is realized by taking in “copies” from the world and the world is enabled to set higher copies only through the constant reactions of the individual self upon it. Morally I am as much a part of society as physically I am a part of the world’s fauna ; and as my body gets its best explanation from the point of view of its place in a zoölogical scale, so morally I occupy a place in a social order ; and an important factor in the understanding of me is the understanding of it.—BALDWIN, *Mental Development, etc.*, pp. 487 seq.

The presiding genius of the spiritual life of the nineteenth century is Kant, the modern Socrates. This is not the place to give an account of his mental development. Suffice it to say that he gathered up in himself,

and did his best to harmonize, all the forward movements of the three preceding centuries. Descartes and Locke met in him. He set the dogmatism of Wolf off against the scepticism of Hume, and found both equally unsatisfying. Hume, the modern Protagoras, had completely dissolved the independent, given world of ancient and mediæval thought, and defied men to prove the existence of any world other than that composed of their own impressions and ideas. Here was individualism with a vengeance! Kant clearly saw that Hume could not be refuted, and that he had completely changed the aspect of the philosophic problem. Of old the question had been: How does a world existing external to, and independent of thought, find its way into the human consciousness? Now it is: How does the mind, whose world consists solely of its own experience, ever come to think that there is a world external to, and independent of, that experience? It was no longer, How does the world get into the mind, but, How does it get out of the mind?—no longer, How does the mind appropriate a world already existing? but, How does it build up any world of which it can predicate existence? Kant saw that this was as great a change in the spiritual world as the Copernican astronomy had been in the material. According to the new view, education is no longer world-appropriation, but world-building. Each man, by his own mental processes, builds up his own world. The question is: How is this done? and Kant undertakes to reply. The subjectivism of Descartes and Locke has come to fruition; Protestantism has found its philosophy; freedom, its essential condition.

Next to Hume, it was perhaps Rousseau who most

deeply influenced Kant. Hardly any two men were ever more dissimilar in character and aims than the Genevese sensualist and the Königsberg rigorist; and yet the one had something to give to the other. There was more in Rousseau besides his sensuous, unsocial ideal of life, and his absurd notions about education. His passionate love of nature, his glowing descriptions of its simple delights, and his call to men to abandon burdensome and distorting conventionalities and live a natural life, formed a timely message, which the world needed, and which it received with gladness. It convinced Kant that true human progress is progress in living, and not merely in knowing. To live truth is better than to know it.* If the intellectual scepticism of Voltaire influenced him but slightly, it was because it was a mild affair compared with that of Hume, which was thoroughgoing.

Stirred up by Hume and Rousseau, Kant sent forth this message to the world, and particularly to its teachers: Let each soul build up within itself a coherent and rational world, so that it can lead a free, moral, natural life in the society of other souls. This is not, indeed, Kant's formulation of it; but this is what he meant. His timidity † and a curious and a very illogical assumption of "things-in-themselves," independent of thought, introduced confusion and contradiction into his system, and left open the door for a new dogmatism, such as we find in Schelling and Hegel, and a new scepticism (re-christened agnosticism), represented by men like Mansel,

* On the effect of Rousseau's teaching upon subsequent literature, see my *Rousseau*, pp. 211-244.

† He said: "I have the very clearest conviction of much that I shall never have the courage to say; but I shall never say what I do not think."

Huxley, and Spencer. It is often wise to accept a man's principles, and ignore the conclusions which his timidity drew from them. If we do this with Kant, we shall find that his message is clear and strong. It is needless to say that, unless the ultimate in being be identical with the ultimate in knowledge, there is no possible escape from scepticism, or dogmatism, which is but disingenuous scepticism. Could Kant have seen that feeling is the ultimate both in being and in thought, the true thing-in-itself, all his difficulties would have vanished, and the fundamental conditions of moral life would have become something more than "postulates" for him.* Even his "categorical imperative" would have been unnecessary, because he would have found the source of all moral authority in the human breast.

After Kant's death, the extravagances and horrors of the French Revolution, in which the forces of freedom had prematurely exploded, caused a reaction against freedom itself, and a return to mediævalism, authority, and supernaturalism. In Catholic countries, this took the form of a romantic, sentimental Neo-Catholicism; in some Protestant countries, that of a return to Neo-Platonism or philosophic mysticism.† This reaction, naturally, affected education, leaving it, to a large extent, on the old lines and in the hands of the clergy. Nevertheless, the new Neo-Platonism, being, like the old, essentially evolutionary, did valuable work in its way,

* I am here assuming in my readers a certain acquaintance with Kant's philosophy. If this seems unwise, I would only say that without a knowledge of that philosophy it is impossible to understand the educational movements and needs of the present.

† The "Restoration-Philosophy" of Hegel is quite as reactionary in principle as the Catholicism of Bonnet and Châteaubriand. It is needless to say that Catholicism remains irrevocably committed to the principles of tradition and authority.

by showing that there is order and development in the process of the world, and offering a new field and meaning to science. Though it still, in spite of Kant's warning,* functioned with empty logical abstractions—Being, Naught, Becoming, etc.—instead of with the concrete facts of existence, and, therefore, frequently arrived at arbitrary and false results, fatal to liberty, it, nevertheless, performed a great service, in insisting upon the fact that the material of science and education is a process, an evolution, and can be explained only as such.† Thus it was that ideal, paved the way for real, evolution.

In spite of this, it was not from the reactionary movements, Catholic or Protestant, of the early part of this century, that advances in education sprang, but rather from those freedom-seeking movements of the eighteenth, which received a temporary check in the French Revolution. They can nearly all be traced back to Rousseau and Kant, and may be classed under five heads (1) the instructors, (2) the instructed, (3) the matter of instruction, (4) the methods of instruction, (5) the end of instruction.

(1) Advance with reference to instructors: From the days of Alcuin to the rise of Protestantism, education was almost entirely in the hands of the clergy. Since that event, but particularly since the French Revolution, there has been an increasing tendency to withdraw

* "Thoughts without content are empty ; intuitions without concepts are blind."—Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*.

† It is interesting to note that all the ancient words for nature (*φύσις*, *γένεσις*, *natura*) have this meaning. Our modern terms, *evolution* and *development*, have false implications. Growth is not merely a mechanical unfolding.

it from their hands and place it in those of laymen. Along with this has gone a tendency to withdraw it from the Church altogether, and hand it over to the State. At the present day a system of state education, conducted chiefly by laymen, prevails in all protestant, and also in some catholic and "orthodox," countries, such as Italy and Greece. Even Egypt has such a system. It is not long since every college and university in the United States thought it necessary to have a clergyman for president. At present a very large number have lay presidents, and that number is yearly increasing. Even in our public schools there is very little tendency to allow the clergy to give instruction even in their special subject—religion. What religious instruction there is, is usually imparted by the ordinary lay teachers, the majority of whom are women.

(2) Advance with reference to the instructed: In the Middle Age, education, in the sense of "book-learning," was confined almost entirely to the clergy, while the nobility obtained instruction in what may be called the knightly arts at the courts of princes or bishops.* The Reformation and Renaissance extended book-learning to the well-to-do classes generally; but very little was done for the poor, or laboring classes. Even Locke refused to consider them, and Rousseau bluntly declared that they needed no education. It was the attainment of self-consciousness by the people † at the French Revolution, coupled with Kant's contention that every hu-

* See the Introduction of *The Babees Book*, in the Publications of the Early English Text Society.

† It is but fair to say that Rousseau, despite his opposition to popular education, greatly contributed to this, by his intense sympathy with the life of the people.

man being is his own end, that imparted to the cause of popular education that impulse which, during the greater part of this century, has been spreading from land to land. At the present day there is a general consensus that education ought to be universal, and, indeed, it must be so in every democratic country that hopes to continue such. Without education liberty is impossible.

(3) Advance with reference to the matter of instruction: While education was in the hands of the clergy, the subjects studied were chiefly those relating to religion and the supernatural. Not only philosophy, but all science, was held to be ancillary to theology. Reason itself had to accept dictation from authority. Nature and the natural sciences, culture and the culture sciences, received but little attention. Education, looking backwards, strove to impart ancient, especially "revealed" truth, frequently displaying a dread of the intrusion of new truth.* Revelation had shown what nature must be; the followers of revelation cared little to inquire what it was. In proportion as education has passed into the hands of the State and the laity, it has, more and more, turned its attention to nature, and life in nature. Instead of reasoning downward from causes, or a Cause, supposed to be independently known, to effects or facts, it examines the facts, and reasons up from them to their causes, determining the latter wholly by the former. This is the method of science, as opposed to that of theology. It follows naturally that, whereas the subjects of the old education consisted of authoritative texts, calling for an ascetic discipline, those of the

* See White, *Hist. of the Warfare of Theology with Science*.

new education are the facts of nature and culture, calling for a many-sided development of the individual, as essentially a social being.

(4) Advance in the methods of instruction: Learning by heart and cultivating obedience, under dread of the rod, was, on the whole, the method of the older education. All needful truth being known, the teacher had only to impart it, and this was most readily done through the memory, which could be quickened by the rod.* Even the rules of arithmetic were committed to memory, no attempt being made to understand them.† Moreover, since all truth depended upon authority, the proper attitude toward it was, not comprehension, but acceptance and obedience. Discussion, to be sure, there was in abundance, especially in the Jesuit schools; but, as the conclusion, in every case, was known beforehand, it could be little more than a pretence at a search for truth. Truth uncomprehended could not be intelligently obeyed: hence the need for the rod.‡ In all this, the new education stands in almost direct opposition to the old. It makes authority dependent upon truth rationally comprehended, and trusts to such comprehension for conformable conduct. In a word, while the old education was education for subordination, the new education is education for freedom, or intelligent coöperation. The latter, therefore, endeavors, not to crowd the memory with words, but to develop the in-

* And how it can be quickened! A few years ago, I found, in the "waqf" schools of Cairo, many boys of fourteen and fifteen, who could repeat the entire Qorân, a work about as long as the New Testament.

† This within my own memory.

‡ The extent to which the rod was used, even in recent times, is now almost incredible. I have known of fathers complaining because their boys were not "thrashed" at school. Cf. Hinsdale, *Horace Mann*, pp. 190 sqq.

telligence, by the direct study of the facts of reality. It is a parent, guiding the mind, not a slave-master, driving it. It is daily becoming better aware of its own conditions and implications, as it shows plainly, by its insistence upon "child-study," which, no doubt, will soon be supplemented by parent-study, teacher-study, and the study of social environment.

(5) Advance with reference to the end of education: The aim of the old education was to prepare for another world, for a life after death. Its view of this world is admirably expressed by Moore:

"The world is all a passing show,
For man's illusion given :
The smiles of joy, the tears of woe,
Deceitful shine, deceitful flow :
There's nothing true but Heaven."

With such a view, this life was, of course, despised, and provision made for it only reluctantly. The body, as belonging to this world, was shamefully neglected, and at certain periods recklessly abused. The laws of civic life were ignored, so that society often sank into barbarism. The path of moral life was not supposed to lead to heaven, but at best to limbo.* Only the path of faith and ecclesiastical observance led to the former. The aim of the new education is very different. While

* See Dante, *Hell*, IV., 31-42. "Thou askest not what spirits these are which thou seest? Now I wish thee to know, before thou goest further, that they sinned not; and if they have merits, it sufficeth not, because they had not baptism, which is part of the faith which thou believest. And if they lived before Christianity, they worshipped not God duly. And of these same am I [Virgil] myself. For such defects, and for no other sin, we are lost, and are only so far afflicted that, without hope, we live in desire." It would be easy to match this view from the works of recent writers, Cardinal Newman, Henry Drummond, etc.

by no means setting lightly by, or denying, eternal life, it insists upon making the most of this life, holding it to be a phase of the other, preparatory to all other possible phases. The more completely we unfold our powers, and perform our duties, personal, domestic, social, political, in this life, the better prepared shall we be to enter upon the functions and joys of another.* Hence the new education sets up, as its aim, the highest development of the social individual, in all the faculties of body, soul, and spirit. It seeks to prepare men for a heaven hereafter by inducing them to create a heaven here and now. It is true, indeed, that it does not always show itself conscious of this great purpose, finding much difficulty in freeing itself from mediævalism; but, as time advances, this consciousness grows clearer and clearer.

Such is the new education, as contrasted with the old. It remains for us to trace briefly its progress thus far, and to indicate its future course. In doing so, we must confine our attention to salient points, abandoning all attempt to follow it in detail, or in different countries. These points are marked by a few great names.

The first man who took a notable step forward in education, on the lines of Rousseau and Kant—that is, toward Nature and Reason—was Pestalozzi,† who, though born before the middle of the eighteenth cen-

* See Matthew XXV. 14-30.

† Heinrich Pestalozzi, born at Zürich, 1746; loses his father, 1751; follows agriculture, 1765-75; conducts a primary school for poor children on his farm at Neuhof, 1775-80; becomes a writer on education, 1780-87; resumes agriculture, 1787-97; made a citizen of France, with Washington and Klopstock, 1792; conducts orphan asylum at Stanz, 1798-99; the schools at Burgdorf, 1799-1802; visits Paris, 1803; conducts a secondary school at Yverdon, 1805-24; returns to Neuhof, 1824; dies, 1827.

ture, belongs in spirit, and largely in activity, to the nineteenth. With little learning, and less system, but with overwhelming faith in the people and love for children, this warm-hearted, devoted man may fairly be said to be the father of modern popular education. In depth of feeling, he resembled Rousseau, from whom he borrowed much; but, unlike Rousseau, he was inspired with a lofty morality and sense of duty, which made him consecrate his life to education, as the only means whereby the people might be redeemed from vice, degradation, and misery. His practical results cannot be estimated highly, and his books are full of wordy sentimentality and confusion; but, in spite of this, he succeeded in imparting a new spirit and scope to education, in almost every direction. Above all, he insisted that education should be extended to the whole people, that its methods should be kindly and considerate, and that it should relate to things rather than to words, to facts rather than to rules. He aimed to cultivate not merely the intelligence, but also, and still more, the affections, the moral judgment, and the will. He insisted that children should learn not only to think, but also to do, and hence that education should consist largely of manual labor.

Whatever success Pestalozzi had was due, not to any reasoned plan or clear ideal, but to the infectious enthusiasm of his ardent, loving personality. If Rousseau is the parent of the modern love of nature, Pestalozzi is the parent of the modern love for children, and it is this love that has transformed education from a harsh, repressive discipline into a tender, thoughtful guidance. In Pestalozzi, Rousseau's demand for an education through nature, and Kant's demand that every human being

should be regarded as his own end, met and found realization, through love that fuses all things. If Rousseau had made men aware of the glories of nature, Pestalozzi demanded that children should be made acquainted with them. If Kant had emphasized the worth of the individual soul, Pestalozzi insisted that that worth should be realized and recognized. The recognition of nature led to science, that of individual worth to true ethics. After Pestalozzi, people saw children with new eyes, invested them with new interest, and felt the importance of placing them in a true relation to the world of nature and culture. It is not too much to say that all modern education breathes the spirit of Pestalozzi. It is education for freedom, not for subordination.

Nevertheless, Pestalozzi's work, like Rousseau's, was of the nature of a reaction, and, like all reactions, one-sided. The older education had directed its attention mainly to the memory, and operated through authority. Pestalozzi, turning his back on both these, sought to develop the powers of observation and generalization, and to operate through love. The reaction was most salutary; but it needed to be corrected. After all, memory and authority have a legitimate place in education, as in life, and cannot safely be neglected. Observation without memory, and love without authority, are vain, as was plainly shown by the failure of all Pestalozzi's practical experiments in teaching.

To remedy the defects of his system, to round and complete it, has been the task of Pestalozzi's followers, among whom must count every prominent teacher of the century. This task, which is far profounder than the pioneer Pestalozzi conceived it to be, resolves itself

into this: How to construct in the soul of the child such a world that it shall find therein complete and harmonious exercise for all its faculties, intellectual, affectional, volitional. With a view to this it becomes necessary to study the powers of the child, the processes by which knowledge is acquired, arranged, and stored up, the methods by which the affections are heartily elicited and trained to distribute themselves in accordance with the worth of things for moral ends, the discipline by which the will is rendered autonomous and placed beyond the influence of passion and appetite, and, finally, the conditions of bodily health, strength, and plasticity. Only when such knowledge is attained and applied is it possible fully to realize that education which we have called human, which places the soul in the triple relation of knowledge, love, and will to all that exists. Though this great task is still very far from being accomplished, the followers of Pestalozzi have already taken considerable steps toward its accomplishment. Chief among these are Herbart, Fröbel, Rosmini, and Horace Mann.

The work of Herbart* may be said to consist in combining the method of the old education with that of Pestalozzi, in recognizing the importance of memory and mental construction in the acquisition of knowledge. Setting aside Kant's doctrine that the mind is a group of moulds—forms of sense, categories of understanding,

*Johann Friedrich Herbart, born at Oldenburg, 1776; goes to Oldenburg Latin school, 1783, and studies Wolf's philosophy; enters the University of Jena, 1794, and becomes acquainted with Schiller and Fichte; deserts Fichte's views, 1796; private tutor in Interlaken, 1797-99; in Jena, 1800; in Bremen, 1801; in Göttingen, 1802; takes Kant's chair in Königsberg, 1809; marries Mary Drake, 1811; returns to Göttingen, 1833; dies, 1841. See *J. F. Herbart's Pädagogische Schriften*, mit H.'s Biographie herausgegeben von D. Fr. Bartholomäi; and De Garmo, *Herbart and the Herbartians*, in "The Great Educators."

postulates of reason—determining *a priori* all experience, he returned to the Leibnizian notion that the soul is a self-defined, substantial monad, and maintained that all its “ideas” are so many efforts to protect itself from invasion by other monads—in fact, a series of warlike attitudes, each of which, more or less, conditions all succeeding ones. On this basis he built up his Psychology, as an indispensable basis for educational theory and practice.* According to this, mental action is a sort of dynamic chemistry of attitudes or ideas, of which one’s world, at any given moment, is the net result. Ideas are of different strengths and have different affinities, and so can be brought within the domain of mathematics. The soul is conceived as originally a mere undetermined substance. Invaded from without, it assumes an attitude, or idea, which persists. Invaded again in the same way, it emphasizes this attitude; invaded differently, it assumes an attitude compounded of the first, and of the new, reactions. Thus it proceeds, assuming more and more complicated attitudes, whose elements enter into the most various relations to each other. The attitude which it assumes to each fresh invasion will be determined by the complex of attitudes previously assumed. This assimilation of new ideas by means of ideas already assimilated Herbart calls “apperception.” The aim of the teacher should be to make these ideas, or attitudes, form an harmonious whole, so that each new invasion, or experience, may find an appropriate place in it. The moral character of the soul (and the end of all education is moral character) will

* Indeed he may be called the father of modern experimental Psychology, Fechner, Wundt, etc., being his disciples.

depend upon the nature of this whole and the hierarchic relation in which its parts stand to each other. When each part claims its proper degree of "interest" and attention, the character will be perfect.

It is easy to show serious defects in Herbart's psychology. His notion of a soul-substance is a pure piece of Greek mythology, having, when properly investigated, no meaning, but leading, when unwarily accepted, to agnosticism and fatalism. His chemistry of ideas, in which, apparently, the soul plays no determining part, is as purely mythical as the battles of the Centaurs and Lapithæ, and likewise leads to fatalism, which, indeed, he frankly professed. His insistence that ideas precede feelings in the mind, and that the latter are relations between the former, is a complete inversion of the truth, which is, that ideas are distinctions between feelings or groups of feelings. The lower orders of being have feeling without ideas. And so on. The fact is, Herbart's psychology is antiquated, fragmentary, and fanciful, and the same is true of all his work. His mind lacked both depth and system. But, for all that, he did excellent work in the cause of education; (1) by recognizing the need of psychology as a basis for it; (2) by insisting, as against Kant, that the entire content of consciousness is due to experience, and therefore can be modified by education; (3) by recognizing that moral life is the end of all education; (4) that such life depends upon the nature of the world organized in the mind and soul, and can, therefore, be furthered by education. Herbart's followers have done much to correct his errors, to rid his system of its mechanical and fatalistic elements, and to bring into relief its merits, so

that it occupies at the present day a very distinguished place in the educational world.

The man who did most to carry on the work begun by Pestalozzi, was Fröbel, the parent of the "Kindergarten." * Whereas Herbart philosophized about education, and lectured in universities, Fröbel devoted himself to teaching, and finally, to the earliest stages of it. But there were more fundamental differences than this. While Herbart's world was pluralistic, consisting of mutually invading and resisting monads, related to each other in a mechanical way, Fröbel's world was monistic, guided by a single universally interfused power. His marked tendency to mysticism and pantheism, which hence resulted, can be accounted for by the circumstances of his early life; but it belongs to an old order

* Friedrich Wilhelm August Fröbel, born at Oberweissbach in Thüringen, 1782; loses his mother, 1783, and is left almost without education till 1792, when he goes to school at Stadt-Ilm; apprenticed to a forester, 1797; enters University of Jena, 1799, but is a failure; studies farming at Hildburghausen, 1801; loses his father, 1802; holds various offices connected with forestry, 1802-5; becomes a teacher at Frankfort, and devotes attention to the art of teaching; visits Pestalozzi at Yverdon, 1805; private tutor in Rousselian fashion, 1807; takes his pupils to Yverdon, 1808, and remains two years; studies the plays of boys; returns to Frankfort, 1810; attends University of Göttingen, 1811-12; Berlin, 1813; a soldier, 1813-14; in Royal Museum at Berlin, 1814-16; goes to Griesheim and opens the "Universal German Educational Institute" in a cottage; moves with institute to Keilhau, 1817; marries Henrietta Wilhelmine Hoffmeister, a pupil of Schleiermacher and Fichte, 1818; publishes his "Education of Man," 1826; his institute attacked and ruined, 1829; tries to work in Switzerland, 1829-32; returns to Keilhau, 1832; moves to Burgdorf, 1835, and is appointed director of the orphanage; reaches the notion of the kindergarten, and conceives a plan for the education of mothers; moves to Berlin, 1836; starts his "Institution for the Nurture of Little Children," at Blankenburg, 1837; loses his wife, 1839; invents the name "Kindergarten," 1840; publishes his *Mutter-und Kose-Lieder*, 1843; leaves Blankenburg, and lectures in various parts of Germany, 1844-49; settles at Liebenstein and opens an institute, 1849; moves to Marienthal, 1850; marries Luise Levin, 1851; kindergartens forbidden, as socialistic, in Prussia, and Fröbel taxed with atheism, 1851; dies, 1852. See Bowen, *Fröbel and Education through Self-Activity*; Miss Shirreff, *Life of Fröbel*.

of thought, and involves assumptions not justified upon his own principles. Pantheism, if fully thought out, proves fatal to all possibility of moral life, while mysticism is almost sure to lead to a breathless, wide-eyed pietism. In Fröbel's own practice they did comparatively little harm; but, in those of his weaker followers, they have led to manifold aberrations—sentimental religiosity, vain talk about “symbolism,” and the like—which have often, like rank weeds, overgrown his system.

But, in spite of this drawback, which was merely a tribute to the unconquered past, Fröbel is the prince of educators. He was the first to see, and to state clearly, that education is conscious evolution, and to draw the practical conclusions from this insight. The very term “Kindergarten” tells the story. It means a garden in which the plants are children, who, in order that they may attain the greatest perfection, are to receive the proper care and nourishment at the proper time. He saw distinctly that all upward evolution is due to continuous self-activity, under the proper stimuli, or with reference to the proper objects, and that such activity, evoked in an orderly way, and continually progressing, is true blessedness.* He insists, therefore, that the child shall be self-active in the acquisition, and assimilation, as well as in the expression, of knowledge; moreover, that knowledge which does not go through all these three processes is vain and fruitless. This view, it need

* Aristotle (*Eth. Nicom.* Bks. I, X.) maintained that man's happiness and perfection consisted in the actualization or energy (*ἐνέργεια*) of his highest and distinctive faculty, *viz.*, reason, a view which was largely responsible for the mediæval exaltation of contemplation, as against practice. Fröbel holds that they consist in the progressive and harmonious actualization of all man's faculties, in the evolution of the entire human being.

not be said, is diametrically opposed to the mediæval one, which held that human nature, being corrupt, needed to be suppressed and replaced. Frœbelism is humanism, pure and simple. But, though Frœbel insisted that education is the development of human nature, he was very far from holding, as some of his followers seem inclined to do, that it is the unregulated manifestation of human "spontaneities." This would be mere unculture. No one believed more completely in regulation and discipline than Frœbel; only he maintained that they should be applied with full understanding of the present condition and future ideals of their subjects, which means that they should be applied gently and rationally. He saw, what few people see, that, though children are born with what are called evil tendencies, these may be starved into inaction, while good tendencies,* though weak, may be nourished into complete energy, by having their proper "good" supplied to them in the proper degree and at the proper time.† Having observed that the tendencies of children manifest themselves most fully in play, he concluded that there they can be most effectively dealt with. Hence the kindergarten, which is a scheme for regulating play in such a way that, without ceasing to be play, it shall be made a means for developing, in an ordered way, the whole nature of the child.

This is not the place to enter into the details of the kindergarten, with which Frœbel's name and fame are

*I believe no tendency ever shows itself until it has received some sort of satisfaction.

† It is strange that Frœbel should have maintained, in spite of this, that children are naturally good. This is a mere shred of Rousselian sentimentality, of a piece with his mysticism. Nothing is *naturally* either good or bad. Both are moral and acquired attributes.

chiefly associated; but two facts must be emphasized: (1) that Fröbel demands for the human being an education in and through its entire environment, that is, the universe, past, present, and future; (2) that his system is applicable, not only to small children, but to human beings at all stages of education. If Fröbel confined his chief attention to the former, it was because he wished to lay his foundation secure before proceeding with his superstructure. The latter he had to leave to other hands, which have not yet, to any large extent, appeared.

The chief weakness in Fröbel's system has already been pointed out. There are a few minor ones, which may be here touched upon. (1) The system is adapted specially to German children and German ideals, and requires considerable modification before it can be adopted, with success, by other peoples. This fact has not been sufficiently regarded by English and American teachers. (2) It wastes time in making children learn consciously what they would soon learn unconsciously and without effort.* We should never forget that unconscious learning is the best. (3) It is apt, in the hands of inferior teachers, to leave children with the notion that all education must be play, and therefore delightful. (4) It is too much inclined to confine the attention of children to the things about them, and thereby to stunt the imagination. The unfamiliar, and even the unknown, dimly conceived or held only by a word, is perhaps the most interesting part of a child's world, and it is certainly the one that is most useful for

* For example, in making them trace back the bread they eat, through various processes, to seed-corn.

the cultivation of the imagination. Nature-study is admirable; but it ought to be supplemented by the study of the products of the creative imagination. Men devoted to natural science are wont to be defective in imagination, and to lose their taste for poetry. Even Darwin had to complain of this in his own case. Stories relating to things they have never seen are of high interest and value to children. It is often well to make them commit to memory poems, and later to read books, which they do not at the time fully understand. What child fully understands the old ballads, or the novels of Sir Walter Scott? And yet what treasures they are! What is more delightful and educative than *Alice in Wonderland*? And yet who, young or old, understands it? Frœbel would doubtless have learnt much from it. (5) The *Mutter-und Kose-Lieder* are mostly mere doggerel, apt to destroy, rather than cultivate, the child's sense of rhythm, poetic diction, and poetry, and they are not improved by translation. Many of them, moreover, are too childish for American children.

But these are mere spots in the sun, and the fact remains that all future education must be built upon the foundation laid by Frœbel.

The pedagogical writings of the Roman Catholic Rosmini * in many ways resemble those of Herbart and

* Antonio Rosmini-Serbatì, born at Rovereto in the Tyrol, 1797; studies at Padua, 1817-21; loses his father and inherits a fortune, 1820; ordained priest and visits Rome, 1821; studies at home, 1820-26; founds an institution for the *Daughters of Charity*, 1825; at Milan, 1826-28; sets out to found a religious order at Domodossola, 1828; in Rome, 1828-30; at Domodossola, 1830-34; priest at Rovereto, 1834-37; retires to Stresa, 1837; his institute (*Brothers of Charity*) approved by the pope, 1839; goes as Piedmontese envoy to the pope, 1848; declines the presidency of the papal ministry, 1848; returns to Stresa, 1849; his works examined by the Congregation of the Index, and finally dismissed as free from censure, 1851-54; dies, 1855. See *Life*, prefixed to my translation of his *Philosophical System*, London, 1882.

Fröbel, though he seems to have been acquainted with neither, and though his thought rests upon principles widely different from theirs. Indeed, his work may be regarded as a combination of Herbart's theory of apperception with Fröbel's doctrine of education, as ordered evolution.* He is as much interested as either in nature-study, and in the moral elevation of man; but his distinctive merit is his insistence that there is a definite order in apperception, and that, corresponding to each successive grade of apperceptive "intellection," there is a grade of volition. With admirable cogency he shows that the natural progress of the mind is from ideas of large denotation to ideas of large connotation, *e.g.*, from plant, through flowering plant, rose, to damask rose. If a child is told that a certain plant is a damask rose, he is apt to call every plant by the same name, and has to correct himself at every onward step; whereas, if he is told that the same object is a plant, every step in his future progress will be correct; for all flowering plants, roses, and damask roses are plants; all roses and damask roses are flowering plants, and all damask roses are roses. Such is the natural order of apperception; such is the way to cultivate the observation of nature and to learn the relations between its different parts. "A thought is what serves as matter, or supplies the matter,

*His chief pedagogical work, *Del Principio Supremo della Metodica e di alcune sue Applicazioni in Servizio dell' Umana Educazione*, remained a fragment, not extending beyond the fifth year of the child's life; nevertheless it contains his whole theory. It was written in 1839-40, but was not published till 1857, two years after his death. It rested upon a large amount of careful child-study. It has been translated by Mrs. Maria Gray (Boston, D. C. Heath & Co.). There is a second volume containing shorter essays, chief among which are (1) *On Christian Education*, (2) *Essay on the Unity of Education*, (3) *On Liberty of Teaching*.

for another thought. Such is the law. It is evident that if one thought serves as matter, or supplies the matter, for another thought, this second thought cannot possibly arise until after the first has arisen and supplied the matter which it requires. Now, this shows the natural and necessary order of all human thoughts.

“All the thoughts that ever entered, or can enter, the mind of man are distributed and classified into so many different orders according to this law. Those orders are:

“*First*, thoughts that do not derive their matter from previous thoughts.*

“*Second*, thoughts that derive their matter from thoughts of the first order, and from no others.

“*Third*, thoughts that derive their matter from thoughts of the second order (and so on). . . .

“This series of orders is endless; hence the infinite development to which the human intelligence is ordained.” . . . (§§ 75, 76.)

Having laid down the law of apperception, Rosmini proceeds to describe, and account for, the different orders of “intellection,” and the volitions corresponding to them. He finds that they may be reduced to four, as set forth in the table on the next page.

With regard to this table three things may be noted—(1) that it might be continued indefinitely; (2) that Rosmini lays the same stress upon interest that Herbart does, (3) that moral choice and life begin only with the fourth order of intellections. With respect to the last Rosmini says: “Mere *appreciative volition* would not suffice to justify us in declaring that a child had arrived

* Of course, the matter of the earliest thoughts consists of undifferentiated feeling. The function of thought is differentiation.

	ACT OF THE INTELLECT.	CORRESPONDING ACT OF THE WILL.
I. Order..	Perception of the subsistent.	<i>Affectional</i> volition, directed upon the subsistent thing as a whole.
II. Order..	Abstraction of the interesting sensible qualities.	<i>Affectional</i> volition, directed upon the sensible quality alone, good or bad (abstracted, that is sundered from the other indifferent qualities of the thing).
III. Order..	Judgment regarding the qualities of objects, or <i>synthesis</i> , whereby it is affirmed that a given interesting quality is in a given subject.	<i>Appreciative</i> volition, directed upon the object, in so far as the mind recognizes in it the interesting quality, and so appreciates it.
IV. Order..	Comparison of two objects already judged, and the pronouncing of a third judgment, which prefers the one to the other—appreciation.	<i>Appreciative</i> volition, preference, choice between two objects (§ 333).

at the use of its *freedom*. . . . If the appreciation and the consequent choice relate to things belonging to the material order, or even to merely intellectual things, there may be choice, and yet no freedom. This begins to manifest itself, the first time that a man begins to compare the moral order with the other, inferior orders; the first time he has to choose between the performance of his own duty and his own pleasure, or the satisfaction of his accidental instinct.

“But this first time occurs just at the fourth order of intellections. The collision between alluring things and his duty takes place as soon as he knows a *positive will* that opposes his natural inclinations. Now this will is known to him at the fourth order.” (§ 334.)

It is impossible here to enter into the details of Ros-

mini's method; but perhaps enough has been said to show that it contributes an important addition to the work of Herbart and Frœbel.* His Pedagogy rests upon an entire philosophic system of marvellous extent and subtlety, a system which seeks, by combining Scholasticism with modern thought, to furnish a rational basis for catholic theology. Though this fact necessarily hampers him, he must yet count as one of the ablest thinkers of the century, perhaps the very ablest. He was well acquainted with modern thought, and strove to be just to it.† His life was that of a saint.

Herbart, Frœbel, Rosmini—by these three men the foundations of modern education for rational liberty were securely laid. Each had his defects; each paid his tribute to an unvanquished past; but the defects are such as time and experience are certain to remove, as the tribute to the past ceases to be paid. We can now clearly see, and all true educators do see, that education is conscious evolution of the entire human being through ever closer relations, intellectual, affectional and ethical, to the entire universe, human and subhuman. The only question that remains is: How can these relations be most readily and most securely established? Even this question is already partly answered, and will be more fully answered in the future.

If space permitted, it would be interesting to follow the spread of the new education in different countries,

* It borrows much from the Protestant Mme. Necker de Saussure (1765-1841), who again owes much to Rousseau and Pestalozzi. Her work, *L'Education Progressive, ou Etude du Cours de la Nature Humaine* (1836-38, 3 vols.), is one of the sanest works on education ever written, well deserving more attention than can here be given it.

† As a consequence, forty of his tenets were recently condemned by the Church, as savoring of heresy.

and to see how it has everywhere affected the individual and social life; but we must confine ourselves to its progress in the United States, in which perhaps it has celebrated its noblest triumphs. For this the credit is due, in very large measure, to Horace Mann.

The first Europeans who came to settle in North America were people of considerable cultivation, people who had reaped the fruits of the Reformation and the Renaissance. They were pious, and they loved learning, especially such as might enable them correctly to interpret the Book in which they found the matter and guarantee of their faith. This was especially true of the colonists of Massachusetts Bay, who very early in their history established a system of public schools,* of three grades—primary, secondary and collegiate. Their example was followed, in some degree, by the other colonies, and for a time all went well. But in proportion as the colonists were removed in feeling from the cultured social medium of the old country, and turned their attention to their own immediate needs, mostly of a material sort, interest in culture and education gradually died out. A most competent authority has said that, for a hundred and fifty years, nothing deserving the name of literature was produced in America. From about 1680, the schools, being unprovided with state funds, and left to the tender mercies of towns or, later, of school-districts, deteriorated more and more, until at last, before the Revolution, many members of good families could hardly write their own names. The Revo-

* The Boston Latin School was founded, 1635; Harvard College, 1636; compulsory primary schools, 1642. In 1647 there were in Massachusetts eight Latin (or grammar) schools. "Grammar" and "Latin" were at that time synonymous terms, as they are now in Scotland.

lution brought but little improvement. The people of that time had other things than education to think about. In the first third of the nineteenth century, things went from bad to worse. "Previous to 1826, there were one hundred and seventy-two towns in the State [of Massachusetts] that were required to maintain schools in which Greek and Latin were taught; the legislature of that year removed the obligations from all these but seven, and the seven were all maritime towns. Nor was Latin much taught in the schools that professed to teach it. The ancient and honorable name 'grammar school' now disappeared from the Massachusetts statute book, and the name 'high school' took its place. Verily the State had found the descent to Avernus an easy one! The people of Massachusetts seemed almost as anxious to get rid of their schools as their ancestors had been to get them." * So far did this deterioration of the public schools go that, about the middle of the eighteenth century, private academies began to grow up. As these were attended mainly, if not wholly, by the children of well-to-do people, they helped to draw between rich and poor a line most fatal to democracy. At the same time, they did good work and helped to raise the standard of education, especially in the colleges. In the southern states wealthy families sent their children, for higher education, to Europe.

It is hard for a dependent colony ever to take an independent stand in anything. Hence, it was not till after the United States had achieved their independence, and settled down to consider what the new nation was

* Hinsdale, *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States* ("Great Educators" series), p. 17.

to represent, that people turned their attention again to public education. At the opening of the nineteenth century, education was pretty generally diffused among the people of the northern and western states; but it was of a low order, seldom going beyond "the three R's." Legislatures passed generous enactments in regard to it; public lands were set apart, in the new states, for its maintenance; but there existed no ideal of education; the teachers were mostly poor, and their methods crude. Primary education was imparted chiefly in "dame's schools," most of which were poor enough. The movement in favor of realistic education, due to Rousseau and Pestalozzi, had not reached these shores. In truth, American intellectual life had not begun: America did not understand herself.

It was toward the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century that the quickening of intellectual life, and interest in culture movements, began. Then a sort of spiritual spring, calling every hibernating thing to new life, broke over America. Literature began to revive; art put in a timid, childlike appearance; philosophy glided in gently and somnambulistically, in the night-gown of Neo-Platonism or Transcendentalism; Utopian theories of Arcadian social orders fluttered down from a clear sky, like a swarm of blue butterflies; and, finally, education, which was to transform all these, in view of new conditions and new ideals, showed its earnest face.

From early in the century, advocates of popular education had not been wanting;* but the first man who fully understood the needs of the nation, and undertook

* On Horace Mann's predecessors, see Hinsdale, *ut sup.*, pp. 46-74.

to meet them in large, practical ways, was Horace Mann,* to whom American culture owes more than to any other person. He was exactly the influence needed by the nation in her hour of spiritual awakening.

Unlike Herbart, Frœbel, and Rosmini, who were educational philosophers, Horace Mann was distinctly a practical man. What educational theories he had were chiefly drawn from George Combe's *Constitution of Man*, in which phrenology plays a large part. He was more like Pestalozzi, with all Pestalozzi's human sympathy, democratic interest, and moral enthusiasm, but with a practical sense and a talent for organizing which were lacking in the older man. He saw what the people needed, if they were to be raised out of ignorance, degradation, and misery, and remain faithful to the democratic ideas of the Puritans. First of all, the system of public education, initiated by the Puritans, but now fallen into decay, must be restored, and the undemocratic tendencies of private academies neutralized. But the restored system must be so modified as to meet the new conditions that had arisen in the course of two hundred years. To these tasks he set himself with all the energy and enthusiasm of his nature.

His appointment to the secretaryship of the Massachusetts Board of Education, an office which he held for twelve years, gave him just the opportunity he needed and desired to bring the state of education, with

* Born at Franklin, Massachusetts, 1796; repelled by Calvinism, 1806; attends Brown University, 1816-19; tutor at Brown, 1819-21; studies law at Litchfield, Connecticut, 1821-23; practises law, 1823-27; State representative in Massachusetts, 1827-33; senator, 1833-37; secretary of the newly appointed Board of Education, 1837-48; member of U. S. Congress, 1848-52; president of Antioch College, 1853-59; dies, August 2, 1859. See Hinsdale, *Horace Mann*, and *Life and Works of Horace Mann*, by Mrs. Mann.

suggestions of reform, before the public. The board itself had no executive power; but it could give information and advice, not only to the legislature, but to all the world. The secretary made up his mind that it should not be merely ornamental, but in the highest degree useful. So he set out to collect facts and statistics of all sorts, and to consider projects of educational reform, and these he embodied in his famous twelve annual Reports, which must count among educational classics. A summary of the contents of these reports will show us the range of his activity, and the nature of his projects.

Report I. (1837) relates to (1) school-houses,* (2) school-committees, (3) popular feeling toward the common schools, (4) teachers. In all these he finds much to criticise. The school-houses are poor and squalid; the committees frequently perform their duty in a perfunctory way, giving places to inefficient teachers, failing to visit the schools, and to see that they are duly attended. The common schools are becoming schools for the poor, while the rich are sending their children to private schools. The teachers are poor and poorly paid: many of them take to teaching merely as a temporary expedient. They give no moral instruction, keep no registers, etc.

Report II. (1838) touches on the general "unsoundness and debility" of the schools, but is mostly devoted to the subjects of spelling and reading, in which improvements are suggested.

Report III. (1839) deals mainly with the question of

* These were treated specially in a supplementary report, which soon followed the other.

school libraries, and their value as adjuncts to the schools.

Report IV. (1840) is occupied with the evils attending the district-school system, the needless multiplication of small, poorly taught, and ungraded schools, the qualifications of teachers, the attendance of pupils, and the relations of the parents to the schools.

Report V. (1841) endeavors to show "the effect of education upon the worldly fortune and estates of men." It is found to be of great economic value, and therefore may justly call for large expenditure. It is not merely ornamental.

Report VI. (1842) insists upon the study of Physiology, and other practical subjects in schools, in preference to subjects having little or no immediate use in daily life.

Report VII. (1843) gives an account of the author's visit to the schools of Europe—Great Britain, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France (Paris)—made in that year. He saw much that interested him and, especially in Germany, much that he thought might be profitably adopted at home—normal schools, oral instruction, etc. One thing he strongly disliked, the use of the public schools for the support of the State-religion.

Report VIII. (1844) deals with recent improvements in the public schools, their growing republicanism, the increase in the number of female teachers, teachers' institutes, the use of the Bible in schools, etc.

Report IX. (1845) deals with the apportionment of school funds, the means for doing away with school vices, etc., and ends with an account of Pestalozzi's method of teaching.

Report X. (1846) treats of the history of the Massachusetts public schools, and shows that the narrow puritanical, and merely protestant, basis upon which they originally stood must be abandoned, and that their scope must be widened so as to include all the children of the commonwealth, whose property is pledged for their moral and civic education. Again, as in Report IV., he condemns the school-district system.

Report XI. (1847) discusses the value, for social and moral character, of a common school education, and contains the replies of experienced teachers to a circular making inquiries on this subject.

Report XII. (1848), in which Horace Mann takes leave of the Board of Education, considers "The Capacities of our Present School System to Improve the Pecuniary Condition and to Elevate the Intellectual and Moral Character of the Commonwealth," and gives reasons for the reformatory and critical course pursued by the secretary.*

A glance at this meagre summary will show how completely Horace Mann had grasped the problem, not merely of civic, but also of human, education, and how clearly he understood how it was to be practically solved. The following are the points upon which he laid special emphasis:

(1) Education in a democracy should be public and extend equally to all classes of the population. The public schools ought to be good enough for the best, so that there should be no inducement for the rich to send their children to private schools, and so separate them from those of the poor. Freedom from caste.

* Abridged from Hinsdale's *Horace Mann*, pp. 160-80.

(2) Education should rest upon science, and not upon authority. It should bring children into direct contact with the facts of nature and culture, and allow them, as far as possible, to make their own inductions. The method of Pestalozzi is the true one. Horace Mann says nothing of Herbart, Frœbel, or Rosmini.

(3) Education should encourage true religion; but it should be free from sectarian bias, and the sects should not, as such, be allowed to interfere with it. Freedom from supernaturalism.*

(4) Education should be a preparation for life, domestic, economic, social, political, and not merely the acquisition of curious learning, elegant scholarship, or showy accomplishments. Its end should be the attainment of moral and social personality.

(5) Education should be imparted with gentleness and with due regard to the nature of the child. All violence, and all corporal punishment, should, as far as possible, be avoided.

(6) Education should be conducted in well-built, well-ventilated school-houses, supplied with good libraries, and all apparatus necessary for effective teaching according to the new method.

(7) Education should be in the hands of thoroughly trained and competent teachers, making teaching their profession, and to this end there should be established Normal Schools for their special training. American Normal Schools owe their existence to Horace Mann.

(8) The schools should be open to girls, as well as

* Horace Mann had a hard struggle with sectarianism before he was able to banish it from the schools; but he finally succeeded, and, in doing so, he wrested education from the hands of Authority, and placed it in those of Science.

boys,* and the profession of teacher to women, as well as to men.

(9) Teachers should have frequent opportunities of meeting for discussion and mutual encouragement in institutes and conventions.

(10) To make possible all these things, the State should spare no expense, but should consider its property a trust for the education of its citizens.

On some of these points Horace Mann may have laid too much stress, and in some he may have been mistaken. His notions of "practical education" may have been too narrow; his belief in the value of Normal Schools may have been exaggerated. But, taken as a whole, his ideas concerning the education required by American democracy and by humanity were correct, and the methods by which he sought to realize them valid. Nothing can be a better proof of this than the fact that all the reforms advocated by him have already been, in large part at least, realized, with excellent effect. State education of a high order has become all but universal; more and more it rests upon science and the Pestalozzian method; dogmatic teaching is almost excluded from it; its chief aim is to fit for the great relations of life; it more and more follows gentle and humane methods; school buildings are improved beyond what he would have dared to hope; Normal Schools have been established in large numbers, and have supplied the States and cities with competent teachers; all the advantages of State education are open to both sexes equally; the

* Not till 1789 were girls admitted to the public schools of Boston, and even then not along with the boys. For a specimen of a girls' school-mistress of the early part of the century, see the *Journey* of Mrs. Anne Knight.

vast majority of teachers are women; teachers' institutes and conventions are almost innumerable; compared with the sums spent on education by the United States, those spent by other countries almost dwindle into insignificance. It may be fairly said that Horace Mann is the father of American education.

But that education is already far beyond him. Kindergartens, of which he never dreamt, are springing up everywhere, and setting the example of the true method of education. "Child-study" is becoming a science. Schools, colleges, and universities come into existence as if by magic. Already the country possesses more institutions of higher learning than the whole of Europe. The colleges for women are more numerous than colleges for men were at the beginning of the century. Nay, all the more enlightened of the latter are opening their doors to women.* And so on.

Thus, there is every reason to look with satisfaction, pride, and hope upon the condition and spirit of education in the United States. It is democratic; it is scientific, rapidly shaking off the fetters of authority and dogma; it is free from sectarian bias and confusion; above all, it educates for freedom, and not for subordination. It is the highest type, thus far, of human education. Other countries, despite numerous obstacles, are gradually imitating it, without, in any marked degree, contributing to its evolution. Of what it has yet to do in the way of improvement, we shall see something in the next chapter.†

* Oberlin was the first to do so; under Horace Mann, Antioch did so from the first, making the course identical for the two sexes, as Oberlin had not done.

† It may perhaps seem strange that I say nothing of Herbert Spencer's work on Education; but the fact is I find nothing original in it that seems to me true, while its ethical principles are distinctly objectionable.

CHAPTER IV.

THE OUTLOOK

The first of all blessings is not authority, but liberty. This is my fundamental maxim.—ROUSSEAU.

I think there is something scientific destined to become popular; and it is all that pertains to truth.—ROSMINI.

The study of the duties of citizenship ought to be the foundation of all other studies.—TURGOR.

The property of this commonwealth is pledged for the education of all its youth up to such a point as will save them from poverty and vice, and prepare them for the adequate performance of their social and civil duties.—HORACE MANN.

The successive holders of this property are trustees bound to the faithful execution of their trust by the most sacred obligations, and embezzlement and pillage from children and descendants have not less of criminality, and have more of meanness, than the same offence when perpetrated against contemporaries.—*Id.*

I by no means approve of those schools in which a child used to spend twenty or thirty years over Donatus or Alexander [of Aphrodisias], without learning anything. A new world has dawned in which things go differently. My opinion is that we must send boys to school one or two hours a day, and have them learn a trade at home the rest of the time. It is desirable that these two occupations go side by side. At present children certainly spend twice as much time playing ball, running the streets, and playing truant. And so girls might equally well devote nearly the same time to school, without neglecting their home duties; they waste more time than that in over-sleeping, and in dancing more than is proper.*—LUTHER.

* Quoted by Compayré, *Hist. of Pedagogy*, pp. 119 sq. (Eng. Trans.).

The democratic system of education gives every man the freest opportunity to become in the fullest measure all for which nature has fitted him.—CHARLES W. DABNEY, in the *Forum* for February, 1900, p. 664.

We have now briefly traced the course of education from the earliest times to the present day, and seen that it is conscious evolution, separated by no clear line of demarcation from unconscious evolution, in which the whole subhuman world is engaged. We have seen it begin in supernaturalism and authority, and, by a slow and difficult process, rise to nature and freedom. It has grown with the growth of practical intelligence, and has in all cases been a preparation for life under existing institutions. Where tyranny has prevailed, it has educated for tyranny and thralldom; where freedom has been won, it has educated for freedom. At first confined to a few favored men, chiefly occupied with the supernatural, it has gradually extended its blessings to greater and greater numbers, until in the United States, it is practically universal.*

Here much has been done that deserves the highest commendation; but much yet remains to be done, and perhaps we cannot more fitly close this book than by attempting to point out the improvements that must be made, before education can fully meet the needs of a great democracy that means to last and to retain its own and others' respect. These improvements relate to (1) the being to be educated, (2) the aim of education, (3) its matter, (4) its method, (5) its extent, (6) its teachers.

* It is so in several other countries, Germany, Holland, Scotland, etc.; but we must confine ourselves to the United States. England, strange to say, long remained sadly behind in the matter of education. Her public-school system dates from 1870. It is still struggling against sectarianism.

(1) "Child-study" has already made considerable advance; but it has, so far, confined itself to inquiring into the faculties of the child and the best means of developing them. There is still much to do even in these directions; but there is everything to do with reference to the more fundamental questions: What is the child? Is it a mere cluster of ephemeral feelings and desires which will perish with the dissolution of the body, or is it an eternal being, with an infinite task, a being to which the body is a mere temporary instrument, a special cluster of phenomena? Those who still cling to the old supernaturalism and authority, usually accept the latter view; those who do not, for the most part adopt the former, or quietly ignore the question altogether. Both parties assume that it is insoluble by science, and, hence, those who insist upon an answer are referred to authority, which is thus enabled to retain its hold upon many.

Now, it is surely little short of irrational to spend time and energy in educating a being whose nature and destiny we do not know. Being ignorant of these, how can we know that all our efforts are not vain, or even hurtful? Many a pious saint, even St. Augustine, has believed that "the uneducated carry the kingdom of heaven,"* and, indeed, this was the prevailing view throughout the Middle Age. The answer usually is: The fact, in any case, is so: we do not, and cannot, know man's nature and destiny, and must, therefore, be content "to guess and opine,"† and then do the best we can. But this is surely a most disheartening attitude.

* See p. 126, and cf. the words of Jesus, Matthew XI. 25.

† "Wir können nur raten und meinen."—Schiller.

Fortunately, it is not a necessary one, and it is only our servile dependence upon authority and our mental sloth that make us content with it. A careful study of the human spirit and its activities can leave no doubt that these are eternal in their very nature, superior to time, space, and causation, and, therefore, free. At all events, the subject is one that calls for the profoundest study on the part of educators. Until they reach clearness with regard to it, they can never be sure that they are doing anything right.*

(2) The aim of education is, as we have seen, world-building, the construction, in the child's consciousness, of such a world as shall furnish him with motives to live an enlightened, kindly, helpful, and noble social life,† a life not stagnant, but ever advancing. Now, this aim is at present far from being attained. The worlds which our education, thus far, has constructed in children's souls are, in very large degree, fragmentary, fanciful, and distorted, made up of pieces of science, interspersed with remnants of superstition, and gaudy contributions from fancy. Little attempt has been made to realize in them the unitary world of evolution, revealed by science and interpreted by philosophy. And yet that is the supreme task of education. Only when it is accomplished can men live a rational, open-eyed

* If we wish to see what life would become, even among cultivated men, when the belief in immortality was dismissed, we may read the Quatrains (*Ruba'iyyāt*) of Omar Khayyām, now so much admired by thoughtless people. Cf. I. Corinth. XV. 32; Gœthe, *Faust*, Pt. I., the Wager-scene; Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, XXXV.

† It is needless to say that the world which furnishes a man's motives is the world which he has built up in his own soul. If it is mean, or foul, or fragmentary, or distorted, so will his life be. Compare Hamlet's world (Act II., Scene 1) with Faust's (Pt. II., Act I., opening), and see the respective results.

life, with lofty aims, and confidence in the possibility of reaching them. The first condition of all truly moral, reason-guided life, is a true world-view (*Weltanschauung*); for reason is nothing but the order of the world, and moral life is a life in accordance with that order. Nature-study, as against text-study, is the educational watchword of the day, and it is well; but nature must be made to include culture,* and the whole regarded as one, coherent universe-process of interacting spirits advancing to ever higher attainments. The imparting of the whole is the task of the educator.

(3) The matter of education is the entire universe, as knowable, lovable, modifiable. To master this matter, in all its details, even if it were within our reach, is beyond the power of any one mind. We cannot, therefore, complain, if education makes no attempt to impart it. But the general scheme of evolution, and of the relations of its different phases and agents to it and to each other, is capable of being grasped, and should be imparted by education. It is not necessary that every one should know all the details of astronomy, mineralogy, chemistry, biology, or sociology; but every one should know the fundamental principles and spheres of these, and of all other sciences, as well as their relations to each other in the evolutionary process. He should, moreover, know how to interpret the whole in terms of experience, and thus to escape the pitfalls of agnosticism and dogmatism. Now, education at present is very far from having realized this ideal. It seems to make no attempt to impart a total view of the world, in its three aspects, as the condition of rational life. In

* See my *Rousseau*, pp. 8, 9.

all respects its work is fragmentary. It imparts no connected knowledge of the universe; it does not seek to arrange things and processes in the order of their desirability, that is, of their value for spiritual ends; it does not show by what means the will can gradually modify the world, in order to make it more subservient to the purposes of spirit. Thus, children are not taught to identify themselves, in any way, with the great world, and so they miss the wonderful inspiration that comes from such identification. The world remains to them a mass of particulars, whose interconnection and co-operation they do not see, and so they stand before the great all-embracing drama of evolution without comprehending it, or recognizing their own place in it. Is it any wonder that the world is uninteresting, and life undramatic, narrow, and dreary, to so many people?

There is, at the present day, a great deal of popular talk about making education "practical," which in most cases means that it should be mostly confined to such instruction as shall enable people to make a competent living. But surely, "life is more than food, and the body than raiment." What are the necessities, or even the material luxuries, of life, if life itself be narrow, with no outlook upon the great drama of existence, no interest in the great movements of history? The effort to elevate the so-called lower classes, by trying, through socialism, paternal legislation, and similar questionable means, to secure their material comfort, implies a complete misunderstanding of human nature. Give people, first, large, comprehensive views of life, with the inspiration that comes from them, and material comforts will take care of themselves. One intelligent

glimpse of the drama of life will quench all desire for the pleasures of the dive and the prize-ring. In our endeavor to feed men's bodies, we starve their souls, and make them hanker after the husks that the swine eat. The most truly practical education is that which imparts the most numerous and the strongest motives to noble action, which creates the most splendid world of thought, love, and beneficence in the human soul. Men are weak, sinful, and poor because they lack motives to be otherwise. Let education give them these motives, and weakness, sin, and poverty will vanish from the earth.

(4) Though very much has been done in the last half century to improve the methods of education, and though, thanks to Herbart, Fröbel, and Rosmini, the true method has been discovered, yet much of our education still follows the old methods, or no method at all. Indeed, the fundamental question with regard to method is rarely asked, much less answered. That question is: How, and in what order, shall the activities of the human being be evoked, so that it may differentiate itself into a rich, harmonious world, and thus rise to a large, moral life? The kindergarten does its best to give a practical answer; but even here, as we have seen, there is much to be desired;* whereas the higher schools, for the most part, ignore the question altogether, and go on, in their old fragmentary way, without any thought of the world that will result from their work: nay, most of them are still weighted with mediæval methods and

* See G. Stanley Hall, *Some Defects of the Kindergarten in America*, in the *Forum*, January, 1900, pp. 559 sqq.

ideals,* or make it their chief aim to fit for professional life. Far too little attention is paid to Rosmini's grades of "intellection," and their correlation with acts of volition. Though there is much talk of the "correlation of studies," it is rarely carried on in view of the end of all study, and hence reaches no definite conclusion. The truth is, even the kindergarten requires considerable modification, in order to suit it to American conditions; † and, when it is so modified, its methods, with due adaptation, must be carried forward into all grades of education, imparting unity of plan and purpose to the whole. A clear distinction must be drawn between culture, on the one hand, and erudition and professional training, on the other. The first ought to be shared by all; the last two are necessarily confined to individuals and classes. And not only ought one scheme, with one definite purpose, to extend from the kindergarten to the university, but all the kindergartens, universities and other institutions of learning in the nation should freely unite into one great hierarchic agency for the culture of citizens fit for a democracy. The seat of the national government ought to be the central seat of learning; the Bureau of Education, while exercising no authority, should be the most influential department of the national government. Indeed, it ought to be erected into a separate Department. Even from a national point

* This is especially true of universities, many of which have not escaped from sectarianism even.

† One crying need is a collection of kindergarten poems—real poems like "The Mountain and the Squirrel," "Castles in the Air," "Wee Willie Winkie," etc., and not pieces of doggerel, like most of the *Mutter-und Kose-Lieder*; another is a collection of children's stories, such as Andersen could write at his best, "How to make Soup of a Sausage-pin," etc., and quite unlike those that figure so largely in our children's periodicals and kindergarten literature.

of view, Education is surely as important as Agriculture, which already has a department and a minister to itself.* The culture of men is surely as important as the culture of plants and animals. The latter are means; the former are ends.

(5) How far should education extend? This question has a double meaning. It may mean: To what depth should it go? or What classes of the population should it include? And, granting that it should include all classes, we may take it to mean: How deep should education go in each of the various classes of the population? It is in the last sense that we shall here consider it, or rather one aspect of it.

As long as men have different endowments and tastes, there will be different grades of education for different classes. Moreover, as long as the distinction between rich and poor exists, the children of the former will find it easier to obtain a high order of education than those of the latter. The former will stop short at the grammar or high school, while the latter will go on to the college or university. Thus, to a large extent, distinction of culture will coincide with difference in wealth, and this distinction will be emphasized, if, as is but too often the case, the rich, untrue to the principles of democracy, send their children to expensive, and therefore exclusive, private schools, while the poor have to be content with the public ones. Now, while the last

*It is an encouraging sign that Washington's dream of a great national university, for the behoof of which he even left a legacy, seems, after the lapse of a century, likely to be realized. See an admirable article, by the President of the University of Tennessee, in the *Forum* for February, 1900, on "Washington's University." It is to be hoped that this institution will set the tone, and give unity, to all the institutions of learning in the nation.

fact is lamentable, it is impossible to alter the general condition. High education cannot be forced upon people who do not desire it, and the poor cannot have all the advantages of the rich. But in this matter the nation, as represented by the states, has a duty, which calls upon it to educate all its citizens to such a degree that none of them shall become dependent paupers or discontented incapables, always a menace to society, and that all shall fully understand their duties and privileges as citizens, and be prepared to claim the latter while performing the former. Now, it is quite obvious that the states have not done their duty in this respect. There still exists, almost everywhere, a large amount of incapacity, poverty, and discontent, with all the forms of degradation and danger that follow from these; while large numbers of the population, knowing neither their duties nor their privileges, as citizens, become an easy prey to selfish politicians, who counsel them against their own best interests, and whom they furnish with power, most dangerous to society and to the nation. If the United States is to remain a democracy otherwise than in name, this state of things must cease, and nothing can make it cease but the education of the masses. This education must take two forms, (1) training with a view to earning a livelihood, and avoiding poverty, with all its evils, and (2) civic culture such as shall enable its recipients to do their duty as citizens, and not be mere "dumb, driven cattle" in the shambles of self-appointed owners.

The truth is, there is a great gap, ever threatening to become a devouring abyss, in our educational system. Nay, it may even be said that the very education which

is most needed is not given. We educate only people of leisure—children in our schools, young men and women, knowing little more of life than children do, in our colleges and universities. The great body of the people, who have to “go to work” early, and who, as becoming early acquainted with “life’s prime needs and agonies,” are by far the most susceptible of true education,* are left out in the cold, condemned, for the most part, to toil in a narrow, sordid world, without outlook, and to be the tools of unscrupulous exploiters. For the sake of these, nay, for the sake of the entire people, we must extend the blessings of education to them. Our scheme of public education will never be complete, will never even do its best work, until it supplements its present institutions by a whole system of evening training-schools and colleges for the breadwinners, the former to impart such skill as shall enable them to give to society, by a reasonable amount of labor, an equivalent for a decent livelihood, the latter to open up for them the treasures of the great world of nature and culture, and enable them worthily to perform their part as members of family, society, and state.

At first sight, it will, no doubt, seem extravagant to suggest that our different states should add to their already expensive system of public schools another system perhaps equally expensive; but a little reflection will dispel this impression. In the first place, education is never expensive: it is worth far more than is ever paid for it, as Horace Mann showed long ago. Every

* No one who has ever taught a class of intelligent breadwinners will return willingly to academic teaching. It would be well if all college students were engaged in the practical duties of life.

educated citizen is a treasure to a nation, far more valuable than a heap of gold or diamonds. Education is strength; ignorance is weakness. The United States owes its high place among the nations to-day to the education of its people. In the second place, education is the only thing that can do away with those internal evils that disturb the peace, and threaten the existence, of the nation—labor troubles, saloon politics, haunts of vice, slum-life and the like. These things exist because a large body of our people, from want of education to open up to them the world of great movements, and noble interests and enjoyments, are condemned to narrow, sordid lives, and petty or vicious interests. We disinherit them of the spiritual treasures of humanity; we condemn them to vulgarity, meanness, squalor, and discontent, and then we wonder why they are vulgar, mean, squalid, discontented and—rebellious. We make all the nobler delights of cultured life impossible for them, and then we wonder why they take to vulgar delights. We leave them ignorant of the true principles of social and economic life, and then we wonder that they are led astray by social and economic charlatans. We do not teach them the value of the vote, and then we are disgusted to find them selling it for a glass of whiskey. We do not cultivate them into moral independence, and then we condemn them because they are the slaves of party politicians. We leave them without high motives, and then despise them because they are guided by low ones. In our impotent folly, we try to offset the gaudy saloon, with its cheap exhilarations, by the tame café, the silent reading-room, or the chaperoned recreation-room, and we wonder why these arouse so

little interest—just as if we could outshine the glare of a conflagration by lighting a few tallow candles! No interest can be dimmed except by the introduction of keener ones. If we would quench interest in the saloon, the pool-room, the dance-hall, the dive, the low theatre, we must offset them by something arousing a warmer and more enduring interest. Their true rivals are the manual-training school, the polytechnic institute, the lecture-room, the class-room, the college, the art-gallery, the classic theatre and concert-hall. Until we have offered the people the attractions of high things, we have no right to complain that they are attracted by low things.

But it is not merely for those workers who are attracted by low things that we ought to provide higher education. There is a very large majority who, despite their toil, poverty, and petty worlds, strive honestly to do the best they know, to live clean lives, and to shun the haunts of vice. These are longing for higher and richer worlds than they have, and it is the State's duty to supply them with the material for these. It is encouraging to see that already some efforts are making in this direction. A few of the larger cities have arranged courses of evening lectures, in the public-school buildings, and their efforts have been seconded by private liberality. All this is excellent, as far as it goes; but it does not go far enough. The lectures are often superficial, disconnected, and desultory, furnishing transient amusement rather than systematic instruction. Many of them deal with topics that are sufficiently dilated upon in the newspapers and magazines, and call for no intellectual effort. Besides this, there is no way of hold-

ing the audiences responsible for results—no examinations, oral or written, no demand for work of any sort on their part. Now, every educator to-day knows, or ought to know, that all the best education is due to self-effort, and that lectures are valuable only in so far as they evoke this. For this reason classes are always better than lectures. The teacher should become acquainted with his pupils individually, and endeavor to supply the needs of each one. In dealing with the breadwinners, there is no agency so beneficial as personal sympathy, clear of all condescension. "I am one of you" is the "Open sesame" for all doors.

The truth is, there ought to be in every city ward, and in every country village a People's University, consisting of three parts, (1) a Manual Training School and Polytechnic Institute, in which instruction should be given in all the arts; (2) a College, which, eschewing authority, sectarianism, and all the mediæval rags and symbols, to which most of our colleges at present cling, shall impart a coherent scientific culture, laying special stress upon those sciences which relate to the history and constitution of society;* (3) a Gymnasium, with baths, recreation-rooms, and rooms for lectures on hygienic and kindred subjects. For public lectures and plays, there should be a well-appointed theatre.

All these things are already realized somewhere, and have only to become general, in order to meet the needs of the whole people. To take a single example: Thirty-five years ago, Mr. Quintin Hogg, a young Scotchman,

* There should be classes in Evolution, History of Culture, the Circle of the Sciences, Sociology, Economics, Comparative Philology, Art, Religion and Politics, Philosophy, Psychology, with more special classes in the different sciences, literatures, languages, etc.

fresh from Eton, started the "Pioneer Institute for Technical Education," in the lowly form of an evening "ragged school" for boys. For the last twenty years it has occupied the "Polytechnic," a stately building in Regent Street, in the heart of fashionable London. The following quotations are from a *Times* article printed in a report for 1892. "What differentiates the Polytechnic from others [institutes] is the elaborate system of technical instruction which is open to its members. These members, it may be said, are admitted on payment of a subscription of 3s. [72 cents] per quarter, which entitles them to the use of the library, social rooms, gymnasium, etc., and admission to all the entertainments, while for the technical classes mere nominal rates have to be paid.

"The classes are of two kinds, science and art classes, which are held in connection with the Department at South Kensington; and industrial classes, which are independent, but which are more or less formally related to the City and Guilds of London Institute of Technical Instruction and also to the London Trades' Council. The Industrial classes, again, are subdivided into classes of mechanics and into 'practical trade classes,' for apprentices and young workmen, and it is these last which are the special feature of the Institute. Among them we find classes for various branches of engineering, for cabinet-making and carpentry, including such subordinate departments as the making of staircases and hand-railing; we find classes in wood and stone-carving, in tailors' cutting, in sign-writing, and in practical watch

* The present writer spent an evening in the Polytechnic in 1894, and saw Mr. Hogg among his boys. He will never lose the impression left by that evening.

and clock-making; classes in carriage-building, in printing, in land-surveying and levelling, in plumbing and tool-making, and many other trades. In all these cases it is a condition that no one is to be admitted who is not already engaged, say as an apprentice, in the trade; for the managers of the Institute see how important it is that they should not incur the hostility of the London artisan organizations by turning out imperfectly-trained and amateurish workmen to compete with them in the market.

“The wonder is that young men can be found who care to spend their evenings in doing much the same work that they have been employed upon all day; but such, unquestionably, is the case, and the class-rooms are well-filled with lads making engines, carving wood, shaping bricks, or learning the best method of cutting out cloth. They are led partly by the genuine desire of learning, and partly by the wish to better themselves; for example, a young plasterer, who as yet knows only the plainer elements of his craft, comes to the Polytechnic to learn modelling and cornice-moulding, and when he has learnt his lesson, he, perhaps, emigrates to America and finds himself able to earn something like four times the wages which he has been earning as a simple plasterer in London. In the engineering-room, where there is a certain amount of machinery worked by a central gas-engine, a dozen young men may be seen profoundly interesting themselves in the forming of a screw, or in adapting some roughly cast bolt to the required purpose, and the room is full of iron lathes and other machines, every detail of which has been made and finished on the spot by the boys.

“The variety of the classes is very great indeed. The results are eminently satisfactory, if we can judge from the success of the Polytechnic pupils in the different technical examinations, for they always stand at the head.” (Pp. 22-24.)

In a separate building is the Polytechnic School of Art. “The syllabus comprises: Free-hand and model drawing; practical geometry and perspective drawing in chalk from the cast, ornament and figure, also from foliage, flowers, and other natural objects; painting in monochrome from the round, figure, and ornament; oil and water color painting from copies, drapery, natural objects, &c. Special attention is given to modelling and casting of the separate parts of the human figure, the uses of mouldings, panels, pilasters, and capitals as applied to the industrial arts. A designing and sketching club has also been established in connection with the school, with monthly exhibitions of students’ work, in designing, modelling and painting.” (P. 44.)

There are “Polytechnic Holiday Trips” to Norway, Madeira, Switzerland, the Ardennes, Morocco, and even to America. The fares are made as low as possible. The “Fare for the Norway round journey, including all accommodation, £8.5s.” [\$40.08]. “Nearly 600 undertook the trip.” “This hardly sounds like a description of holiday arrangements for working men, but truth is stranger than fiction.” (Pp. 47 sq.)

Further on, the Report tells us: “At the present time (1892) the members’ roll contains about 3,500 names, and there are besides about 14,000 attending classes or in some way connected with the Institute. The limit of age for members is sixteen to twenty-five, but those

over twenty-five can be admitted as honorary members on payment of a double fee. There is no limit of age for those merely joining classes. The subscription for young men between the ages mentioned is 3s. a quarter, or 10s. 6d. [\$2.52] yearly. . . .

“The expenditure during the last financial year exceeded £34,000 [\$170,000], of which £24,000 [\$120,000] was received in fees from members and students. The deficit on the working was for many years, up to 1889, made up by Mr. Hogg personally, but since then he has been relieved of a portion of the burden and the Institute placed on a more permanent basis.

“In this wise. In 1853 Parliament created a board to superintend the administration of charitable and educational endowments all over Great Britain, and in 1883 a further Bill was passed by which the old London charities were consolidated and placed under the control of the aforesaid board of Charity Commissioners. A large income—upwards of £100,000 [\$500,000] per annum, mainly derived from endowments of ancient standing, the objects of which had lapsed—was thus made available for the purposes laid down in the Act. About £60,000 [\$300,000] per annum were allocated to the advancement of technical and social education.

“How all this bore fruit, and how the Regent Street Polytechnic came to be accepted as a model for nearly a baker’s dozen of similar institutions now springing up all over the Metropolis, may perhaps be more fitly described by an independent writer. . . . He says that, ‘as a matter of fact, very thorough investigation was made by the Board with the view to discover the best way to promote a technical instruction that would

benefit the lower rather than the middle classes. Institutions at home and abroad were studied. . . . As a result, the commissioners concluded that in England only the richer and middle classes would go to day technical schools, and that night schools for apprentices and young people of the working classes should be supported. . . . They were convinced that for the young working men of the Metropolis it was highly desirable that the gymnasium, the swimming-bath, athletic games, and careful physical training should be provided. . . . And thus they had reasoned themselves into the acceptance of Mr. Hogg's Polytechnic as the most complete and desirable form of technical school for the poorer classes of London. They determined to take his school as a model, and to promote the establishment of a series of similar institutes throughout the Metropolis.'

"In accordance with these provisions, the Charity Commissioners have secured an endowment of £3,500 [\$17,500] per annum for the Polytechnic. This endowment, increased by another £1,000 per annum from Mr. Hogg and £1,000 from another source, meets about one-half the annual deficit; £4,000 [\$20,000] per annum has still to be raised until such time as the London County Council devote to technical education some portion of the £163,000 [\$815,000] granted them by Parliament for that purpose.* . . . Mr. Hogg has also made over the buildings, fittings, etc., to a governing body nominated by the Charity Commissioners, by the School Board for London, and by himself and his co-trustees." (Pp. 53 sq.)

*This has since been done.

The Report closes with these words:

“Such, in brief, is the story of the Polytechnic; from a pioneer meeting of thirty-two it has gone on increasing to many thousands. Even if the place had to be closed to-morrow it has done a truly national, nay, an international work, for the lusty growth of the Regent Street Polytechnic is sending forth its branches like a mighty oak, not only into all parts of England, but also of America and other parts of the world, including the Far East.

“Such Institutes are the greatest possible antidotes to intemperance and vice of every kind; they provide healthy physical recreation and amusement for the leisure hour; they help to make a young man a better citizen, and a more capable worker in the battle of life; and, above all, they afford facilities and encouragement to follow out a life made useful in benefiting others, besides opening up to many a young heart the highway to lasting happiness.”

There is no need to apologize for this long quotation. It shows, on the one hand, how much can be done by one earnest man, and on the other, how a great nation can learn from the work of such a man. What Great Britain has done, and is doing, the United States can surely do, and even on a more liberal scale. It is to be noted that the British Polytechnic Institutes include two of the three departments which should be found in our People's Universities—a Technical School, and a Gymnasium. The third department is perhaps the most necessary.

If space permitted it would be desirable to give accounts of other night-universities in Great Britain and

elsewhere, of the London Working Men's College, at which Professor Huxley gives some of his best lectures, of the *Universités Populaires*, which are springing up in every arrondissement of Paris, and in many other cities of France, and so on; but perhaps enough has been said to show that the technical and higher education of the breadwinners is no mere impracticable chimera, but something which might easily be brought about by the efforts of a few earnest men. In regard to the Popular Universities of France, there is one thing especially deserving of notice: they have been started and carried on, as missionary work, by the professors and teachers in the public universities and schools of the nation.* The State, however, is now taking notice of them, and will in time, no doubt, make them part of the national system of education. And this brings us to

(6) The Teachers. When one considers what improvement has been made in the teaching personnel of the United States in the last fifty, and especially in the last twenty, years, one feels ungracious in making any criticisms or suggesting any extensive reforms. And yet, it must be said, such reforms are necessary. Our teachers yet require two things: (1) a much more profound education than they now receive; (2) a much deeper, and more unselfish interest in their work than most of them now have. If ever we are to have the teachers that the nation needs, Teaching must become a liberal profession, alongside Law and Medicine. Those who intend to pursue it must take a full college (culture) course, before entering the School of Pedagogy, and

*They were roused to this largely by the infamy accruing to the nation from the "Dreyfus Case."

such a school they must all enter and go through.* Normal Schools were a necessity in their day, and they have done much good work; but they do not meet our present needs. The education they give is too narrow, too superficial, and too strictly professional to insure, or even to make possible, true culture, which teachers require above all things. A professionally trained teacher, without a background of culture, is a mere pedant, who can never communicate a love for study, or awake the highest interests in the souls of his pupils. But it is not enough for teachers to have culture; they, of all people, must be endowed with the missionary spirit. The teacher who does not feel himself, or herself, an apostle with an important human mission, but looks upon the teaching profession as a mere means of making a living, had better seek some other occupation; and the same thing may be said of the members of all the liberal professions. The physician and the lawyer who labor merely to enrich themselves, and not that health and justice may prevail, have no right to claim a place in these. If the teachers of the nation, with a due sense of their power and importance, would, without hope or desire for material reward, form themselves into an association for the higher education of the bread-winners, as the teachers of France are doing, and each devote a couple of evenings a week to the work, they would soon elevate the culture of the whole people, and remove the worst dangers that threaten society. Pov-

* Up to recent times the school-masters in Scotland had all to be college graduates (M.A.). Hence the high status of popular education in that country and the practical ability of its people. It is said that six-tenths of all the officials in the British Empire are Scotchmen. It was a great thing for Scotland that the country school-masters could prepare boys for college. See the stories of Ian Maclaren and Barrie.

erty, vice, and degradation would, in large measure, disappear, giving place to well-being, virtue, and nobility. There is no more patriotic work than this; for it is not amid the thunders of the battle-field, where men slay their fellow-men, that the noblest civic laurels are won, but in the quiet school-room, where devoted patriots, men and women, combine to slay misery, meanness, and corruption. When will our teachers be ready for this?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

As it is obviously impossible to give here anything like a complete Bibliography of Educational Literature, the following list contains only such works as I have used in compiling the present book.

Abélard, P.: *Ouvrages Inédits (Cousin)*, 1836.

Abélard, P.: *Opera hactenus seorsim Edita (Cousin)*, 1849-59.

Æschylus: *Prometheus, Oresteia*.

Aristophanes: *Clouds*.

Aristotle: *Ethics, Politics, Metaphysics*.

Babees Book (The) (Furnival): *Publications of the Early English Text Society*.

Baldwin, J. M.: *Mental Development in the Child and in the Race*. New York, 1897.

Bartholomäi, D. Fr.: *Joh. Friedr. Herbart's Pædagogische Schriften*. Langensalza, 1890.

Bigg, Charles: *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. New York, 1886.

Boëtius, A. M. S.: *Philosophiæ Consolationis Libri Quinque (Peiper)*, 1871.

Boulger: *History of China*, 3 vols. London, 1881-84.

Bowen, H. C.: *Froebel and Education through Self-Activity*. New York, Scribners, 1898.

"*Brothers of Sincerity*:" *Encyclopædia*. Calcutta, 1842.

Bussell, F. W.: *The School of Plato*. London, 1896.

Compayre, J. G.: *Abélard and the Origin and Early History of Universities*. New York, Scribners, 1898.

Compayre, J. G.: *A History of Pedagogy*. Boston, 1895.

- Dante Alighieri: *Convivio, De Monarchia, Divina Commedia*.
- Darmesteter, James: *The Zend-Avesta, in Sacred Books of the East* (Introduction to 2d Edition).
- Davidson, Th.: *Aristotle and the Ancient Educational Ideals*. New York, Scribners, 1899.
- Davidson, Th.: *Rousseau and Education According to Nature*. New York, Scribners, 1898.
- De Garmo, Ch.: *Herbart and the Herbartians*. New York, Scribners, 1896.
- Delitzsch, Fr.: *Die Entstehung des aeltesten Schriftsystems*. Leipzig, 1896.
- Denifle, P. H.: *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters, bis 1400*. Berlin, 1885.
- Denzinger, H.: *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*. Würzburg, 1895.
- Deussen, P.: *Das System des Vedânta*. Leipzig, 1883.
- Deutsch, Em.: *The Talmud, in Literary Remains*. New York, 1874.
- Deutsch, S. M.: *Peter Abälard, ein kritischer Theologe des zwölften Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig, 1883.
- Dieterici, Fr.: *Die Philosophie der Araber in X Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Leipzig, 1876, 1879.
- Dieterici, Fr.: *Der Streit zwischen Thier und Mensch*. Berlin, 1858.
- Dieterici, Fr.: *Der Darwinismus in zehnten und neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Leipzig, 1878.
- Dill, Samuel: *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. London, 1898.
- Drummond, Henry: *The Ascent of Man*. New York, 1894.
- Drummond, James: *Philo Judæus and the Alexandrian Philosophy*. London, 1888.
- Elser, K.: *Die Lehre des Aristoteles über des Wirken Gottes*. Münster, 1893.
- Frazer, R. W.: *A Literary History of India*. New York, 1898.
- Froebel, T. W. A.: *Works*. (See Bowen's *Froebel*, pp. 197-201.)

- Frothingham, A. L.: Stephen Bar Sudaili the Syrian Mystic. Leiden, 1884.
- Geddes, Pat. and Thomson: The Evolution of Sex. London, 1889.
- Geddes, W. D.: The Phædo of Plato. London, 1863.
- Gladstone, W. E.: *Juventus Mundi*. London, 1869.
- Gobineau, J. A. de: Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale. Paris, 1866.
- Goethe, J. W.: Faust.
- Grote, G.: History of Greece.
- Hallam, H.: Literary History of Europe. Boston, 1854.
- Harnack, A.: Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Freiburg, im B., 1888, 1890.
- Hatch, E.: The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. London, 1892.
- Hauréau, B.: De la Philosophie Scolastique. Paris, 1850.
- Hegel, G. W. F.: Philosophie der Geschichte. Berlin, 1832.
- Heracliti Ephesii Reliquæ (Bywater). Oxford, 1877.
- Herbart. See Bartholomäi.
- Herodotus: History (*Μοῖσαι*).
- Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days.
- Hinsdale, B. A.: Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States. New York, Scribners, 1898.
- Hughes, Th.: Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits. New York, Scribners, 1892.
- Huxley, T. H.: Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews. New York, 1871.
- Jastrow, M.: The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Boston, Ginn, 1898.
- Jebb, R. C.: Homer: An Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey. Boston, Ginn, 1887.
- Josephus, Flavius: Works (Whiston). Edinburgh, 1867.
- Jourdain, A.: Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristotle. Paris, 1843.
- Kuhn, A. F. F.: Die Herabkunft des Feuers. Berlin, 1859.
- Laurie, S. S.: John Amos Comenius. Cambridge, 1899.
- Laurie, S. S.: Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education. London, 1895.

- Lecky, W. E. H.: History of European Morals, from Augustus to Charlemagne. New York, 1869.
- Lenormant, F.: The Beginnings of History. New York, 1883.
- Locke, John: Some Thoughts Concerning Education. New York, 1890.
- Loyola, Ign.: Exercitia Spiritualia. New York.
- Lutoslawski, W.: The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic. London, 1897.
- Mann, Mary: Life and Works of Horace Mann. Boston, 1865.
- Martineau, James: The Seat of Authority in Religion.
- Müller, D. K.: Kirchengeschichte. Freiburg in B., 1892.
- Müller, F. M.: History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature. London, 1860.
- Müller, F. M.: Lectures on the Science of Language (1st Series). New York, 1862.
- Müller, F. M.: Theosophy or Psychological Religion. New York, 1862.
- Necker de Saussure, Mad.: Education Progressive, ou Etude du Cours de la Nature Humaine. Paris, 1836-38.
- Nöldeke, Th.: Geschichte des Qorâns. Göttingen, 1860.
- Pestalozzi, H.: Ausgewählte Werke (F. Mann). Langensalza, 1885.
- Petrus, Lombardus: Sententiæ.
- Picavet, F.: Gerbert, un Pape Philosophe. Paris, 1897.
- Picavet, F.: Roscelin Philosophe et Theologien. Paris, 1896.
- Picavet, F.: Abélard et Alexandre de Hales, Créateurs de la Methode Scolastique.
- Plato: Republic.
- Porphyry: *Εισαγωγή*.
- Preger, W.: Geschichte der deutschen Mystik in Mittelalter. Leipzig, 1893.
- Preger, W.: The Mind of the Child. New York.
- Quick, R. H.: Essays on Educational Reformers. New York, 1890.
- Quintilianus: De Institutione Oratoria.

- Rawlinson, G.: *Origin of the Nations*. London, 1887.
- Rawlinson, G.: *The Five Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*. London, 1862-67.
- Rémusat, Ch.: *Abélard*. Paris, 1845.
- Renan, E.: *Averroës et l'Averroïsme*. Paris, 1869.
- Reuter, H.: *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*. Berlin, 1875, 1877.
- Rosmini-Serbati, A.: *Philosophical System* (Davidson). London, 1882.
- Rosmini-Serbati, A.: *The Ruling Principle of Method* (Mrs. Gray). Boston, 1887.
- Rosmini-Serbati, A.: *Psychology* (Davidson). London, 1884.
- Sayce, A.: *Fresh Light from the Monuments*. London, 1890.
- Sayce, A.: *Lectures on the Religion of Ancient Babylonia and Assyria*. London, 1888.
- Sayce, A.: *The Babylonians and Assyrians*. London, 1893.
- Sayce, A.: *The Egypt of the Hebrews*. London, 1895.
- Scheffel, V.: *Ekkehard*. Leipzig, 1872.
- Schrader, E.: *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (Whitehouse). London, 1885, 1888.
- Schmidt, K.: *Geschichte der Pädagogik*. Köthen, 1874, 1883.
- Schürer, E.: *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*. New York, Scribners, 1891.
- Séailles, G.: *Leónard de Vinci*. Paris, 1892.
- Shirreff, E. A. E.: *Life of Froebel*. London, 1887.
- Siebeck, H.: *Untersuchungen zur Philosophie der Griechen*. Halle, 1873.
- Smith, G.: *The Chaldæan Account of Genesis*. London, 1876.
- Smith, W. R.: *The Prophets of Israel*. London, 1897.
- Smith, W. R.: *The Religion of the Semites*. Edinburgh, 1889.
- Spencer, H.: *Education: Education, Moral and Physical*. New York, 1883.
- Spiegel, F.: *Iranische Alterthumskunde*. Leipzig, 1871-78.

- Spiers, B.: *The School System of the Talmud*. London, 1899.
- Steinschneider, M.: *Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher*. Berlin, 1893.
- Steinschneider, M.: *Die Arabischen Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen*. Leipzig, 1897.
- Stöckl, A.: *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*. Mainz, 1864-66.
- Strassburger, B.: *Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts bei den Israeliten*. Stuttgart, 1884-88.
- Talamo, S.: *L'Aristotelismo nella Scolastica*. Siena.
- "*Theologie des Aristoteles*" (Dieterici). Leipzig, 1883.
- Tocco, F.: *L'Eresia nel Medio Evo*. Firenze, 1884.
- Van den Gheyn: *L'Origine Européenne des Aryas*.
- Villari, P.: *Saggi di Storia, di Critica e di Politica*. Firenze, 1868.
- Wellhausen, J.: *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. Berlin, 1883.
- Wellhausen, J.: *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*. Berlin, 1895.
- West, A. F.: *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*. New York, Scribners, 1892.
- White, A. D.: *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*. New York, 1898.
- Windischmann, Fr.: *Zoroastriche Studien*. Berlin, 1853.
- Zeller, Ed.: *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer historischen Entroicklung dargestellt*. Leipzig, 1874 sqq.

INDEX

- Abélard, P., 160 sqq.
 Abraham, 31 n.
 Abu 'l Feda, 130
 Achilles, 91
 Advance in education, 224 sqq.
 Æschylus, 24
 Agni, 58, 61
 Ahura Mazda, 67 sq.
 Akkad, 32
 Al Azhar (university), 164 n.
 Albertus Magnus, 174
 Alexandrian schools, 116
 Al Farābī, 134
 Alfred, King, 168
 Al Ghazzālī, 147
 "Alice in Wonderland," 239
 Al Kindi, 134
 Andersen, Hans C., 261 n.
 Anglo-Mainyus, 69
 "Animals *vs.* Man," 139
 Anselm, 160
 Antioch (city), 131
 Antioch College, 247 n., 253 n.
 Apollinaris Sidonius, 127
 "Apostles' Creed," 125
 Apperception, 233
 Aquaviva, Cl., 185
 Arab character, 130
 Arab philosophers, 134
 Arabic translations, 134
 Ariel, 11
 Aristophanes, 95, 103 n.
 Aristotle, 8 n., 9 n., 14, 103 and
 n., 132, 134, 168, 174, 177, 190,
 199 n., 231 n.
 Aristotle's Dialogues, 103 n.
 Arnold of Brescia, 162
 Arts of savages, 22
 "Ârya," 55
 Âryan education, 55 sqq.
 Âryans, 56, 58 sqq.
 Ashur, 50
 Asoka, 65 n.
 Assyria, 27, 47 sqq.
 Asur, 47, 67, and n., 68
 Athenagoras, 119
 Athletics, 98 n.
 Augustine, 126, 256 n.
 Avendehut, J. (Ibn Dawud),
 165
 Avesta, 70
 "Babees Book," 225
 Babylonia, 47 sqq.

- Babylonian superstition, 51
 Bacon, Francis, 184, 190
 Bacon, Roger, 188
 Baldwin, J. M., 18 n., 192 n., 218
 Barbarian education, 24 sq., 78
 Barrie, J. M., 275 n.
 Barsumas, 131
 Bar Sudaili, 134 n.
 Bartholomäi, D. Fr., 232
 Beautiful, the, 16
 Bede, the Venerable, ¹³¹128 and n.
 Behistūn inscription, 69 n.
 Benedict, St., 127 sq.
 Berkeley, Bishop, 206
 Bernard, St., 160
 "Beth-hamidrash," 78, 83
 Bigg, Ch. ("Christian Platonists"), 116 sqq., 119 sqq., 123
 Boëtius, 128, 168
 Bologna University, 169
 Bonifatius, 152 sq.
 Bonnet, Ch., 223
 Boston Latin school, 244 n.
 Boulger ("Hist. of China"), 44 n.
 Bowen, H. C. ("Froebel"), 235
 Brahmanism, 58 sqq.
 Breadwinners' education, 262 sqq.
 "Brothers of Sincerity," 135 sqq.
 Bruno, Giordano, 177
 Buddhism, 44, 65 sqq.
 Bureau of Education, 261
 Bussell, F. W. ("School of Plato"), 101 n.
 Byron, G. G., 67
 Cabanis, 195 n.
 Cain and Abel, 25
 Calasanzio, Father, 186
 Caliban, 11
 Calvin, J., 180
 Cambyases, 73 n.
 Carvilius, Sp., 109
 Cassiodorus, M. A., 128
 Castes, 27, 59
 "Catechetical School" of Alexandria, 118 sqq.
 "Categorical Imperative," 223
 Cato, M. P., 109
 Chaldæa, 32, 37
 Charles the Great, 149 sqq.
 Châteaubriand, 223
 "Child Study," 253, 256
 China, 41 sqq.
 Chinese education, 41 sqq.
 Chinese ethics, 41
 Chlodowech, 151 and n.
 "Christian Schools," 186
 Church, origin of, 57
 Chwolsohn, D., 151 and n.
 Cicero, M. T., 110
 Civic education, 75 sqq.
 Clement of Alexandria, 118, 121, 123
 Columba, St., 151
 Comenius, J. A., 191 sqq.
 Compayre, G., 191 and passim
 Conder, C. R., 32, 35
 Confucius, 41, 44

- "Congregation of the Brethren of St. Charles," 186
 Consciousness, 11
Contemporary Review, 18
 Convention, 99
 Copernican astronomy, 177
 Counter-Reformation, 173
 Cousin, V., 161
 Crusades, 165
 Cynics, 103 n.
 Cyprus, 50
 Cyrus the Great, 50 sq. and n., 74

 Dabney, C. W., 255, 262
 Dames' schools, 246
 Dante, 8 n., 175 n.
 Darius I., 69 and n.
 "Dark Ages," 129
 Darmesteter, James, 69 n., 70 n.
 Davidson, Th. ("Aristotle"), 61; ("Rousseau"), 209; ("Rosmini"), 213 n.
 De Garmo, Ch. ("Herbart"), 232
 Delitzsch, Fr., 27 n., 32, 55
 Démia, Father, 186
 Deniflé, P. H., 166 n.
 Denzinger, H. ("Enchiridion"), 123 n., 156
 Descartes, R., 184, 195 sq., 219
 Desire, 3
 Deussen, P. ("System des Vedânta"), 64 n., 65 n.
 Διαγωγή, 102
 "Didactica Magna" (Comenius), 193
 Dieterici, Fr., 135 sq.
 Dill, Samuel, 105, 118, 124, 127
 Diodorus Siculus, 48
 "Dionysius the Areopagite," 157
 Drummond, H., 2 sq., 228
 Drummond, J., 116

 Edessa, 131
 Education, 1, 78
 Education, division of, 13
 Education, history of, 1
 Education for subordination and for freedom, 2
 Egypt, 27, 37 sqq.
 Egyptian education, 37
 Egyptian ethnology, 30 n.
 Eighteenth century, 207 sqq.
 Elam, 68 and n.
 Elser, K. ("Wirken des arist. Gottes"), 103 n.
 Emerson, R., 16 n.
 "Emile" (Rousseau), 210 sqq.
 England, education in, 255 n.
 English revolutions, 144, 207
 Epheboi, 98
 Epictetus, 112
 Epicureanism, 104 n.
 Epitaph on Roman matron, 108
 Erasmus, D., 177
 Eriugena, J. S., 157 and n.
 Esoteric and exoteric, 103 n.
 Essences, 19 sqq.
 Exegesis (Jewish), 79
 Ezekiel, 48

- "Fair-and-Goodness," 94
 Families of peoples, 29
 Fate, 92, 99
 Feeling, 4
 Feeling, desiderant, 10
 Feeling, substantial, 4
 Fénélon, Card., 206
 Fetich, 19
 Fire, 22 n., 26
 Fire-worship, 58, 69
 "Fons Vitæ" (Ibn Gabirol), 81
 France, teachers of, 274 sq.
 Frazer, J. G. ("Golden Bough"), 22 n.
 Frazer, R. W. ("Lit.-Hist. of India"), 58, 59, 61
 Frederick II., 165, 167
 Froebel, F. W. A., 235 sqq.
 Frothingham, A. L., 137
 Froude, J. A., 173

 Galilei, G., 177
 Gâthâs, 70
 Geddes and Thomson, 9 n.
 Geddes, W. D., 92 n.
 Gerbert (Pope Sylvester II.), 159
 Gerhard of Cremona, 165
 German tribes, 149 sqq.
 Gioberti, V., 181 n.
 Gladstone, W. E., 92 n., 93
 Γνωσις, 123
 Gobineau, Comte de, 147
 Gœthe, J. W., 15 n., 105, 124, 148, 164, 171, 207, 257 n.
 Good, The, 16
 Gosche, R., 45, 130

 Gray, Maria, 240 n.
 Greek education, 86 sqq.
 Gregory the Great, 127
 Gregory Thaumaturgus, 121
 Grote, G., 101 n.
 Grotius, H., 202
 Gundissalinus, Dom., 165
 Gymnastics, 94

 Hades (Sheol), 92 n.
 Haggada and Halacha, 80 n.
 "Hagiographa," 80 n.
 Hall, G. S., 260 n.
 Hallam, H., 190
 Hamlet, 257 n.
 Harnack, A., 118, 120, 123 n., 128, 148, 153, 156, 158
 Harran, 131 and n.
 Harvard College, 244 n.
 Hatch, E., 123 n.
 Hauréau, B., 103 n., 161
 Haymo, 155
 Hebrews, 77 sqq.
 Hegel, G. W. F., 101 n., 222
 Hellenes, 87
 Hellenistic education, 114 sqq.
 Heraclitus, 102 n.
 Herbart, F. H., 232 sqq.
 Herodotus, 70 sqq., 73 n., 74 n.
 Hesiod ("Theogony"), 57 n.; ("Works and Days"), 89
 Hieroglyphic Writing, 32
 Hijrah, 133
 Hindu character, 58 sqq.
 Hindu philosophy, 60
 Hinsdale, B. A. ("Horace Mann"), 245 sqq., 250 n.
 Hittites, 30 n., 32, 35

- Hogg, Quintin, 267 sqq.
 "Home of the Fathers," 61
 Homeric Greeks, 91 sq.
 Homeric poems, 88 sq.
 Hommel, Fr., 37
 Horace, 109
 Hraban, Maur, 154
 Hughes, Th. ("Loyola"), 181 sqq.
 Human education, 112 sqq.
 Hume, David, 206, 219, 222
 Hunger and love, 1, 20
 Huxley, T. H., 5, 6, 274
 Hyksos, 47
 Hypothesis, 15 n.
 Ibn, Gábirol (Avicebron), 81, 147
 Ibn Rushd (Averroës), 165
 Ibn Sina (Avicenna), 134
 Ibn Tufail (Abubacer), 147, 210 n.
 Ideas, 101
 Ihne, W., 105
 Imitation, 18
 Immortality, 76
 India, 27
 Individualism, 100
 Instinct, 18
 "Intellection," 241
 Intelligence, rise of, 13 sqq.
 Iran, 66 sqq.
 Irish monks, 129, 150 sqq.
 Isidore of Seville, 128
 Islâm, 130 sqq., 157 sq.
 Israelitish exiles, 68
 Jackson, A. V. W. ("Zoro-aster"), 68 n.
 "Janua Linguarum Reser-
 ata" (Comenius), 193
 Jastrow, M., 50
 Jeremiah, 54
 Jerome, 126
 Jesuit education, 181 sqq.
 Jewish education, 77 sqq.
 Joel, M., 147
 John of Salisbury, 162
 Johnson, Samuel, 17 n.
 Josephus, Fl., 69 n.
 Joshua ben Gamla, 83
 Josiah, 78
 Jourdain, A., 166 n.
 Judaism, its central con-
 cepts, 86
 Juventus Mundi (Gladstone),
 92 n., 93
 Kant, Im., 101, 217 sqq., 222
 sqq., 231
Káδapovis, 102
 Kethubim, 80 n.
 Kindergarten, 192, 235 sqq.
 Kindergarten poems, 261 n.
 Kirjath-sepher, 53
 Knight, Anne, 252
 Knox, John, 178, 180
 Kuhn, F. F. A., 25 n.
 La Salle, Father, 186
 Latin, 109 sq., 178
 Latin fathers, 126
 "Law" (The), 78, 80 n., 116
 Lecky, W. E. H., 112
 Leibniz, G. W., 189
 Lessing, G. E., 173
 Letters, introduction of, 91
 and n.

- " Liberal Arts," 117, 127, 153
 Liutpert, 155
 Locke, John, 189, 195, 197 sqq.,
 219, 226
 Loyola, Ig., 181 sqq.
 Luther, M., 176, 178 sq., 254
 Lutoslawski, V., 102 n.

 " Ma'ād," 142
 Macaulay, T. B., 105
 Mackenzie, 207
 MacLaren, Ian (John Wat-
 son), 275
 Magi, 67 sqq., 78 and n.
 Maintenon, Mde. de, 206
 Manhood examination, 98
 Mann, Horace, 244, 247 sqq.,
 254
 Marcus Aurelius, 112
 Margoliouth, 31 n.
 Martianus Capella, 127, 153
 Massachusetts Bay educa-
 tion, 244 sqq.
 Mathematics, 103
 Mazdeism, 68 sqq.
 Mede=Persian, 73 n.
 Medes, 67 sqq.
 Mediæval education, 148 sqq.
 Median empire, 73
 Medo-Persia, 66 sqq.
 Melanchthon, Ph., 178 sq.
 Menander, 112
 Metempsychosis, 63
 Microscope, 52
 Mills, L. H. (" Avesta "), 70
 n., 73 n.
 Modern education, its ten-
 dencies, 177, 188 sqq.
 Monolatry, 77
 Monotheism, 77
 Montaigne, Mich. de, 177, 210
 Moore, Thomas, 228
 Muhammad, 132 sq., 158
 Müller, D. K. (" Kirchen-
 geschichte "), 131 sq., 159
 Müller, F. Max, 51 n., 57 n., 59
 n., 68 n.
 Muslim education, 130 sqq.
 Muslim universities, 164 sq.
 Mysticism, 134, 150, 156 sq.,
 158 sqq.

 Names, 20 sq.
 Naples (university), 167
 Nature, 12 n., 99 sq., 175 sq.,
 181, 209, 210 n.
 Necessity, 99 sq.
 Necker de Saussure, Mde.,
 243 and n.
 Needs of education, 255 sqq.
 Nestorius, 132
 New education, its aim, 229
 Newman, J. H., 228
 Nicene Creed, 125
 Nineveh, 50, 68
 Nisibis, 131 sq.
 Nöldeke, Th., 133
 Nominalism, 160 sq.
 Normal schools, 251
 Norsemen, 167
 Notker Labeo, 159

 Oberlin College, 253 n.
 Odo of Auxerre, 155
 Odyssey, 109
 Omar Khayyâm, 257 n.
 " Orbis Sensibilium Pictus "
 (Comenius), 193

- Oriental religions, 51
 Origen, 118, 121, 123
 Ormazd, 68
 Orosius, 168
 Outlook (The), 254
 Oxford University, 168

 "Palace School," 153
 Panizzi, G., 18
 Pantænus, 118
 Pantheism, 236
 Paris University, 169
 Parmenides, 195 n.
 Paschasius Ratpert, 155
 Patrick, St., 150
 Patristic education, 124 n.
 Pedagogy, school of, 274
 Pelasgians, 87
 Penitential psalms, 54 n.
 People's universities, 267
 Period of Charles the Great,
 149 sqq.
 Persia, 66 sqq.
 Persian character, 70 sq.
 Persian Wars, 99
 Personality, 76 and n.
 Personality, discovery of, 101
 Pestalozzi, H., 229 sqq.
 Pestalozzi's followers, 231 sq.
 Peter the Lombard, 16 n., 162
 and n.
 Peter the Venerable, 165
 Pharisees, 80
 Philo, 116
 Philosophy, rise of, 99, 103
 Phœnician education, 55
 Phœnix, 91
 Picavet, F., 162 n.

 Picture-writing, 28
 Pietschmann ("Phœnicia"),
 55
 Πίστις, 123
 Plato, 18 n., 67, 101, 102 n., 103
 n., 104
 Plotinus, 123
 Polytechnic (London), 268
 sqq.
 Porphyry, 135, 161, 164
 Post-Aristotelian philosoph-
 ers, 104, 115 sqq.
 "Practical" education, 259
 Præconius Stilo, L. A. E., 109
 Precept, 19
 Preger, W., 150, 156
 Preyer, W. ("Die Seele des
 Kindes"), 192
 Priests and laity, 27
 Priests, originators of sci-
 ence, 28
 Prometheia, 73 n.
 Prometheus, 25 and n.
 Protagoras, 100, 219
 Ptah-hotep ("Aphorisms"),
 39
 Purgation, 94
 Purification, 102
 Puritan education, 244 sqq.
 Pythagoras, 103 n.

 Qorân, 130, 133, 145, 164 sq.
 Quintilian, 110

 Rabelais, 177
 "Ratio Studiorum" (Jesu-
 its), 185
 Rawlinson, G., 37, 48, 50

- Reading, 29
 Realism, 160 sq.
 Reason, 114, 175 sq., 209
 Redemption, Vedāntic, 63 sqq.
 Reformation (The), 173 sqq.
 Religion, 19
 Rémusat, Ch., 161, 170 n.
 Renaissance, The, 173 sqq.
 Renan, E., 165 n.
 Reuter, H. ("Aufklärung im Mittelalter"), 175
 "Robinson Crusoe," 210
 Rogers, J. E. Thorold, 207
 Rollin, 206
 Roman Christianity, 125
 Roman education, 105 sqq.
 Romans *vs.* Spartans, 106
 Roscellinus, 160
 Rosmini-Serbatì, A., 1, 9 n., 239 sqq., 254
 Rousseau, J. J., 209 sqq., 219, 222, 226, 254

 Sabbath, 32
 Sacrifice, 21 n., 27
 Sacrificers, 27
 Sadducees, 80
 Salerno University, 168
 Sargon, 68 n.
 Savage education, 18 sqq.
 Savages, 11
 Sayce, A., 38, 47 n., 49, 50, 53, 69 n.
 Scepticism, modern, 206
 Schelling, 222
 Schiller, Fr., 192, 256 n.
 Schmidt, K. ("Gesch. der Pædagogik"), 45
 Scholastic method, 162
 Scholasticism and Mysticism, 156 sqq.
 Schrader, E., 19 n., 53 n., 68 n., 69 n.
 Schrader, O., 57 n.
 Schriftgelehrte (Scribes), 28
 Schürer, E., 115 sq.
 Science, beginnings of, 28
 Science *vs.* Theology, 175
 Scott, Sir Walter, 239
 Scottish schools, 180
 Scotus Eriugena, J., 1
 "Scuole Pie," 186
 Séailles, G., 174, 189 sqq.
 Semites *vs.* Aryans, 89 n.
 Semitic character, 45 sqq.
 Semitic education, 45 sqq.
 Semitic gods, 88, 90 n.
 Semitic languages, 45
 Seneca, L. An., 112
 Servatus Lupus, 155
 Seth, Andrew, 1
 Sévigné, Mde. de, 200
 Shakespeare, W., 9 n., 11 n., 15 n., 194 n.
 Shalmanezzer, 67
Shēm (meaning), 19
 Shirreff, E. A. E., 235
 Siebeck, H., 101 n.
 Sin, 54
 Sippara, 53
 Slavery of savages, 22
 Smith, George ("Babylonian Genesis"), 57
 Smith, S. F., 18
 Smith, W. Robertson, 21 n., 46 n., 48, 55, 116

- "Social Contract," 210
 Society of Jesus, 182 sqq.
 Socrates, 101 and n., 217 sqq.
 Solonian oath, 98
 Soothsayers, 27
 Sopherim, 53 and n., 78
 Sophists, 101 and n.
 Spencer, H., 1, 8 n., 253 n.
 Spenser, Edm., 14
 Spiegel, Fr., 67, 69 n., 73 n., 74 n.
 Stages of education, 13 sqq.
 State, origin of, 27 sqq.
 Steinschneider, M., 134 nn., 165 n.
 Stoics, 103 n., 104 n.
 "Studium generale," 166 sqq.
 Subject *vs.* object, 101
 Šūdras, 59
 Sumir, 32
 Supernatural beginnings of humanism, 114 sqq.
 Symbol-making faculty, 16
 Σύμβολον, 15 n.
 Symbols, 19
 Syrian church and schools, 131

 Talamo, Sal. ("Aristotelismo nella Scolastica"), 169 n.
 Talmud, The, 79
 Tãoism, 44
 Tennyson, Alfred, 12 n., 61 n., 93 n., 218, 257 n.
 Tertullian on education, 126
 Theodore of Tarsus, 151
 "Theology" of Aristotle, 135, 142
 Theology *vs.* Science, 175
 Θεωπία, 102
 Thomas Aquinas, 163, 174
 Tocco, Felice, 150
 Tool-using faculty, 16
 "Torah," 78
 Town, 26 n.
 Tragedy and comedy, origin of, 89 n.
 Translations from Arabic, 165
 Trendelenburg, Ad., 101 n.
 True, the, 16
 Turanian education, 30 sqq.
 Turanian gods, 88
 Turgot, 254
 Tylor, E. B. ("Primitive Culture"), 12 n., 17 n., 19 n., 21, 46 n.
 Tyrrhenians, 87

 Ulfilas, 152 n.
 Universals, 103 n.
 Universe, the, is social, 8 sq.
 Universitas, 166
 Universités populaires, 274
 Universities, mediæval, 164 sqq.

 Van den Gheyn, 57 n.
 Varro, 110
 Veda, 1, 59 sqq.
 Vedânta, 60, 63
 Vernacular, the, 180
 Vinci, Lionardo da, 187 sqq.
 Voltaire, 222
 Von Eicken, H., 124, 148, 150 sq.

- Walafried Strabo, 155
" Waqf " schools, 227
Washington's university, 262
Werembert, 155
West, Andrew (" Alcuin "),
153
Westcott, B. F., 19 n., 118
White, A. D., 175, 226
Windischmann, Fr., 69 n.
Wolf, Chr., 219
Women, 40
Working men's college, 274
Worth, 94; (pæan to), 15
Writing, 28 sq., 32 sqq.
Wynfrith (Bonifatius), 152
Xenophon (" Cyropædia "), 70
Yahweh, 31 n., 47
Zarathushtra (Zoroaster), 68
sqq.
Zeller, Ed. (" Philosophie der
Griechen "), 103 n.
Zeus, 90 n.
Zodiac, 52
Zwingli, U., 180



ITY



8

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

MAR 31 1959

MAR 21 1959

APR 9 1959

APR 16 1959

Returned,
College Library

APR 15 1959

JUL 22 1959

AUG 5 1959

OCT 22 1959

OCT 28 1959

JAN 26 1960

OCT 24 1963

NOV 18 1963

JAN 14 1964

JAN 21 1964

SUBJECT TO FINE IF NOT RETURNED TO
EDUCATION LIBRARY

RECEIVED

NOV 11 1967

JUL 8 1976

RECEIVED

ED./PSYCH.
LIBRARY

NOV 13 1967

ED./ PSYCH.
LIBRARY

QUARTER LOAN

JUN 23 1976

REC'D LD-URB

JUL 6 1976

UCLA-ED/PSYCH Library

LA 13 D28



L 005 590 919 6

Education
Library

LA
13
D28

ELFO

LY

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 955 027 8

